DRAMATIC TRADITIONS OF THE DARK AGES



TUNISON

00036139

God.
940.1
Tun/Dra
36139



Digitized with financial assistance from



H T Parekh
FOUNDATION

An Initiative by
HDFC
WITH YOU, RIGHT THROUGH

on 28 December, 2018

DRAMATIC TRADITIONS OF THE DARK AGES

DRAMATIC TRADITIONS OF THE DARK AGES

36139
ac

BY
JOSEPH S. TUNISON





TT-U-22

CHICAGO
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
LONDON
T. FISHER UNWIN, 1 ADELPHI TERRACE
1907

COPYRIGHT 1907 BY
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Published May 1907

[illegible]
340.1
[illegible]
[illegible]

Composed and Printed By
The University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois, U. S. A.

TO

FRANCIS WAYLAND SHEPARDSON

WITH FRIENDLY AND FRATERNAL

GREETING

PREFACE

The author of this book sincerely hopes that it will not be taken as a history of the drama in the Dark Ages. He does not assert more than a sporadic cultivation of what would now be called the legitimate theater at any part of the period between Constantine and Otto III. He has merely attempted to hold a brief for one of the parties to a controversy which, in his opinion, has either been ignored or decided incorrectly, for nearly three-quarters of a millennium. This controversy must be brought to a final decision before the literary history of Europe can be written correctly. As was recently said in *The Nation* (Vol. LXXXII, No. 2128, p. 307, col. 2): "The immense value to mediaeval Europe of the influence coming from the Eastern Empire is only in part recognized as yet;" and, if this be true in the domain of art, it is equally true in nearly every other department of human activity.

Under the circumstances, it was natural that the author of this book should occasionally, perhaps frequently, overdo his part. He may have expanded the definition of the word "drama" unduly. On the other hand, he asks critics to consider the point whether or not, in this age of

silent readers, the conception of that word has been as full as it was in times when all learning was oral and aural. It may never have occurred to the great audiences of Aeschylus and Aristophanes that there was anything in the form of a book behind the splendid flow of word and action which they witnessed. It is the very essence of the best drama that it shall seem as spontaneous as ordinary conversation, when published in the only way it can be published—that is, by word of mouth from an open stage to a seeing, listening crowd. The modern phrase "dramatic poem" is a pleonasm. All poems are dramatic by nature; and this is at once understood when a capable reader and a capable hearer meet at the recitation of a lyric, a canto of epic, a fragment of didactic verse, or even a string of well-put gnomic couplets. A drama that cannot be acted is a contradiction in terms. It is something which could not have existed in any age except that of people who read silently, and it becomes drama only because these silent onlookers give it the aid of their imagination. On the other hand, a written drama that can be acted, and is said to have been denied the privilege in an age heart-hungry for spectacles, is a historical miracle. The conviction of the present writer is that this miracle never was performed. He asks the friends of truth in literary investigation to consider the

fact that a written play, even if written by a Shakespeare, is a mere figure of speech, a Pygmalion's statue, until life is breathed into it by the impersonation of the stage. It follows that to the drama, as published in the only way it can be published in its distinctive form, there must contribute not merely the writer of the book, but the actors, the dancers and singers, if these be required, the scene-painter, the stage manager, and the audience. The very figure of an actor may be impressed permanently on the book and the tradition of the play, as in the case of Burbage, who created the character of Hamlet and was actually written up to, especially in the matter of stoutness and other physical characteristics, by Shakespeare himself. Analytically, each of these elements of drama as perfected can be taken by itself, and naturally they can all be followed in directions and to limits where the drama under any definition cannot be found.

Thus, in tracing dramatic traditions as distinguished from the proper history of the drama, one may justly insist on finding them among writings which were not intended for the stage: among rhetoricians, who never became actors; among performers in spectacles; in phrases and formulas that passed from the theater to the church or elsewhere; in the quarrels of the public entertainer with the public moralist; in the reminis-

cence of the schools where public performers were trained; in the games where these performers appeared, and in the festivals, public or private, which were made brilliant by their talent and training. Surely an actor does not cease to be an actor when he employs precisely the same expertness in a wedding march or a Christmas show that he would put to use if posted for a part in legitimate tragedy or comedy.

For these reasons the author of the book which follows claims the right to use as illustrations of his main thesis a number of things which cannot be called dramatic in the strict sense, but which, nevertheless, in his opinion, mark the process of the transfer of theatrical aptitudes from the East to the West, and from ancient to modern times. He asserts no originality except that of having hammered more or less crude material into shape. If the critics say that this was done without smelting, he will answer that this is the prehistoric method in the New World, where only pure gold or copper was used and never subjected to the indignity of the furnace. He is glad to confess his obligations to Constantine Sathas, and he looks forward to the day when Sathas will be studied as a reformer in the history of the whole mediaeval period. The footnotes to the pages which follow cover most other reading obligations. But it must be added that without several cautionary signals

on the part of Professor John M. Manly, and some pointed criticism, the author might have ridden his hobby into some thickets which he hopes he has missed. Even now Professor Manly must be exonerated from any share in the author's opinions. He has shown friendship, but not partiality, in the discussion of a confessedly difficult problem in literary history. Other obligations to scholars and libraries are also to be acknowledged, as well as one to Frank E. Tunison for aid in proof-reading, and a pleasant, friendly one to Judge Charles W. Dustin, of Dayton.


LIBRARY OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I. TRADITIONS DUE TO THE WAR BETWEEN CHURCH AND THEATER 1–64

I. Quarrel between church and stage an ancient one; the result of an oriental prejudice not shared by the Greeks; St. Paul's use of the word "theater;" actors as a class the medium of expression for heathen hatred; spectacular conversions; theatrical excesses 3

II. Triumph of Christianity; defenders of the stage—Libanius, Basil the Great, Basil the Less, Gregory of Nyssa, Gregory of Nazianzen; Chrysostom's attack; paganism represented by the stage 9

III. Festivals and the theater; Byzantine weddings; pageants; Byzantine use of the Roman calends; dramatic festivals of mediaeval Italy and England; persistence of antique customs in Hellenic countries 15

IV. Christianity fused with paganism; literature irreligious; dramatic efforts of men of learning; theatrical phases of Arianism; the church inimical to the histrionic profession; misfortunes of actors and actresses 21

V. Revenge of the stage on ecclesiasticism; play-writing bishops; advantage taken by Arius of the popularity of the theater; *Thalia* and *Antithalia;* dramatic tradition the base-line of Christian hymnology; balladry and hymns; interpretation of the Song of Songs; the first mystery 29

VI. Orientalism in music; women singers; conscious effort to unite the church and the theater; imperial indulgence toward the stage; effort to discriminate in favor of the drama as against games and spectacles; ecclesiastical influence perverted to the Hippodrome 35

VII. Ecclesiastical drama a reaction from barbarism on the throne; Romanus the poet and Anastasius the emperor; literature of the period destroyed in partisan warfare; the popular plays of the Hippodrome and the liturgic drama; the Iconoclastic controversy on the stage; theatrical character of apostolic legends; defeat of the Iconoclasts a victory for the stage as a feature of church life; dramatic exhibitions 42

VIII. Theatrical tendencies of the Iconoclasts felt by the Orthodox party; rapid development of ecclesiastico-theatrical shows; influence of Theophylactus; decrease of state revenues an important factor; transfer of church theatricals to the West; actors among traders and pilgrims; the connection between Byzantium and the West at this time not by way of Italy 54

CHAPTER II. TRADITIONS OF DRAMATIC IMPULSES IN RELIGION 65–133

I. Early Christian dramatic literature; writings of the Apollinarii; parallel between *Christus Patiens* and the passion-play; later Christian dramatists; imperial politics and the drama . . 67

II. Heresy and the theater; alphabetaria; effects of these on hymnology 74

III. Eudocia and the legitimate drama; rhetorical and poetical contests at Constantinople; poems for church recitation; recited dramas of

saints' lives; pagan customs preserved by actors; Anastasius and his dramatists 80

IV. Dramatic critics; an early echo in the West; the antitheatric reaction of Justin; Justinian's attack on the concert halls; Theodora and her career 89

V. Professors and lawyers as dramatic writers in the later years of the empire; the theatric fund; mistake of the Iconoclasts; Orthodoxy compelled to recognize the drama; the histrionic blunders of the monks; prohibitive laws explained away; western lawyers on the subject; church and theater harmonized in the East; actors masked even in late ages; imperial theatrical customs of Byzantium taken over by the Turks 101

VI. Mimes early and late the same in practice; their political influence; transfer of Byzantine stage customs to Italy; Homer and the popular drama; possible effect on mediaeval western literature 113

VII. Professional acting carried through Italy to the West; Venice and the Greek stage tradition; the prolonged Greek emigration to the West; Cardinal Bibbiena's comedy; Venetian laws; Graeco-Venetian jargon; Greek themes and actors in Italy; Italian themes and actors in England; the episode of Italian tragi-comedy . . . 122

CHAPTER III. EASTERN TRADITIONS AND WESTERN DEVELOPMENT 134–244

I. Neglect of Byzantium in western histories of the drama; the visible beginnings of dramatic writing and stage performance at the West; plays of Roswitha; Conrad Celtes and Reuchlin; interest in Roswitha at the time of the Reforma-

tion and earlier; defects of Byzantine history; fragmentary facts collated; the transition from East to West; in Gothic times; in Saxon times . . 137

II. The Saxon empire; its energy in the development of Europe; sketch of the three Ottos; marriage of Otto II and Theophano; characteristics of Theophano and her daughter Sophia; their influence on Otto III; their probable relations with Roswitha; Theophano's Byzantine antecedents 150

III. Roswitha's general literary activity; her loyalty and usefulness to the Saxon house; her preference for Ecclesiastical Greek themes; her reading of Terence; skill as a playwright; her comedies; her error in supposing that Terence wrote in prose; indirect evidence of other dramatic writing in the tenth century; Easter dialogues; tropes and sequences; plays in the eleventh-century monasteries 161

IV. Obvious influence of Roswitha on subsequent literary activity; mediaeval study of Terence; the poetic contest as a dramatic form; the Provençal *tenson;* player clubs of later times; various early dramatic tales in verse; two attempts to reproduce the plots of Plautus; other dramatic pieces of the twelfth century 181

V. The formal dialogue; examples; scholastic disputation imitated in verse; the disputation of Rome with Pope Innocent 204

VI. Scholastic disputation converted to burlesque; goliardic specimens; lively dramatic dialogue and delineation of character before Chaucer; Walter Mapes's familiarity with the works of Terence; dramatic form of several of his prose pieces; his tale of Sadius and Galo; real tragedies of the period 215

VII. Fugitive indications of Mapes's acquaintance with contemporary literature of the East; problematic authorship of the goliardic poems; reminiscence of Greek and Roman mythology . . 236

CHAPTER IV. TRADITIONS BY WAY OF ANCIENT AND MEDIAEVAL ITALY 245–334

I. Boethius and personification; Warton's theory disproved; an eclogue of Bede and a bit of American aboriginal folklore; religious plays 247

II. The fall of man according to Ignatius . . 256

III. Technical peculiarities of the work of Ignatius; probable stage method of the Byzantines; Lydgate's description; early disappearance of Roman drama from the stage; survival of popular Italian forms as literary and acting models in the East; Punch and Judy as a relic of ancient pantomime; Diomedes on the varieties of the Greek and Latin folk-drama, particularly the Atellan farces 259

IV. The Neapolitan Pulcinella; dramatic genealogy of Autolycus; Shakespeare's use of this traditional figure of the old Italian drama . . 270

V. The legend of Sisyphus; antique relations of Pyrrhus; monotony of ancient methods of characterization; Pyrrhus as a character in what were called comedies in the Middle Ages; predecessors of Chaucer; Matthew of Vendôme; Byzantine story-tellers; *Comedy of Lydia* with Pyrrhus as the hero 282

VI. *Comedy of Alda* by William of Blois, in which again Pyrrhus figures; indebtedness to Menander; Chrysostom on the indecencies of the Byzantine stage 295

VII. Buccus in the plays of the Hippodrome; in spite of these farcical pieces and the more

elaborate religious plays; traces suggested of an acting version of Seneca at Constantinople; reminiscence of his style and matter in the so-called Cretan dramas; Mussato's career and his study of Seneca; natural attractions of the turgid Roman tragedy for an Italian at the dawn of the Renaissance; Seneca unjustly censured by modern critics 305

VIII. Historical errors; Roman as well as Hellenic traditions preserved at Constantinople; western religious prejudice led to misrepresentation of Byzantine influence; the language of Byzantium; communication with the West; heritage of the English dramatists; dramatic genius of the English race; this supplemented by reminiscence and example from abroad through a number of centuries; a suggestion as to the proper genealogy of the drama as a type of world-literature; no independent literary origins within the historic period 318

INDEX 335-350

TRADITIONS DUE TO THE WAR BETWEEN CHURCH AND THEATER

CHAPTER I

TRADITIONS DUE TO THE WAR BETWEEN CHURCH AND THEATER

I

In the first place, it is to be observed that the opposition between the Christian religion on one side and the theater on the other has been an important factor in the evolution of both. But this opposition, as we find it at the West, in the Inquisition, in the treatises and discourses of theologians, and the diatribes of such men as were, in England, Northbrooke, Gosson, Stubbs, and Prynne, merely voiced a tradition which was already ancient. The true western spirit, as evinced by that strict logician, St. Thomas Aquinas, was one of tolerance. But the battle had been fought long before at a time when the Greek and Latin churches were still practically one, and when there was no theater but that of the Greeks.[1] Not a single argument against the stage has been adduced since the sixth century that was not fully elaborated before that time. The entire case of the church, so far as it is legitimate, seems to be set forth once for all in a single passage of Lac-

[1] That is, the theater as distinguished from the circus. Even Latin comedy was rarely performed in Imperial times, tragedy not at all.

tantius,[1] and that is a mere drop in the ocean of controversy. It gives no idea of the animosity which led the fathers of the church to reckon actors and mimes, not less than gladiators and charioteers, among abominations. To the ancient Hellene, the theater was a respectable place, and the people of the stage were socially as good as any. But the Greek-speaking races of Syria never sympathized with this feeling. Their latent contempt for persons who acted a part in public was shown in the disgraceful meaning which they fastened upon the word "theater" and which St. Paul perpetuated forever in his immortal writings.[2] This Ebionite antipathy, not at first shared by gentile Christians, was forced upon the latter by the hideous persecutions under Nero. This imperial madman, in his favorite diversions as actor, poet, and public musician, was a revolting object long remembered. During the interval between his tyrannical reign and the final triumph of Christianity, the theater did not fail to give other provocations which increased the resentment felt by adherents of the new religion. In the midst of the persecutions, the dominant party, not satisfied with the slaughter of multitudes, ridiculed from the stage the mysteries of the faith which they were endeavoring to destroy. What the comedies were,

[1] Lactantii *Divinarum institutionum*, Lib. vi, cap. 20. Compare the passage from the *Epitome*, cap. 6.

[2] Particularly by the heated phrases of I Cor. 4:9.

composed in those days to shame the Christians, we have no means of determining with exactness; but, of course, the crime of Herostratus in burning the temple of Diana at Ephesus, merely to perpetuate his name, furnished to the heathen mind an obvious parallel to the alleged crime of the Christians in burning Rome and an explanation of their hatred for temples and idols. Naturally, the actors ridiculed the rude manners and the insane piety of their victims,[1] just as Shakespeare,

[1] Sathas, Ἱστορικὸν Δοκίμιον περὶ τοῦ Θεάτρου καὶ τῆς μουσικῆς τῶν Βυζαντινῶν, ἤτοι εἰσαγωγὴ εἰς τὸ Κρητικὸν Θέατρον. Ἐν Βενετίᾳ, 1878. In this work the Εἰσαγωγὴ and Προλεγόμενα are paged with Greek numerals and the remainder with Arabic numerals. See in this case, Εἰσαγωγή, σελ. ς' (6), λη', λθ', μ', μα', μβ'; also Renan, *Antichrist*, pp. 164–74. Sathas translates Renan at some length and cites Gidel, *Histoire de la littérature française*, p. 366. See also Kurth, *Les origines de la civilisation moderne*, édition abrégée (Tours, 1891), p. 71.

As Sathas will be almost continuously referred to in the notes to this book, it may be well to discuss at the outset his relations to the study of Byzantine dramatic traditions. His defects are obvious. In the first place, when he put all his material about music as well as the drama into a single essay, he made a jumble which can be handled only by taking his Εἰσαγωγὴ apart and putting its divergent array of facts in line with the themes to which they belong. Then, Sathas is far from exact in his criticism. But his defects are overshadowed by the vast reach of his learning. Nothing that was accessible respecting the Greek world of the mediaeval period escaped his attention, and he brought to his reading a hereditary love for, and familiarity with, his subject. His merits are so distinguished that even those who wish to treat his historical and critical theories with contempt are obliged to admit that his book is the first, if not the only, one to read on its theme. For example, Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des oströmischen Reiches*, (München, 1891), after remarking that "Sathas hat eine dickes und schwergelehrtes Buch geschrieben, um das Gegentheil zu beweisen; aber so er sich auch bemüht, jede gut oder schlecht bezeugte Thatsache zu seinen Gunsten zu wenden und jedes Hindernis beiseite zu schieben, erreicht er doch nur das Ziel, den objektiv gestimmten Leser unzähligemal zu ärgern und ihn schliesslich erst recht im Glauben an

ages afterward, satirized Puritanism in the person of Malvolio.[1] Made up as bishops, exorcists, and neophytes, they represented the conversion of some proselyte to Christianity, not omitting even a pretended baptism. More cruel still were the parodies of martyrdom, in which the dying groans of tortured believers were turned into farce.

die Dramenlosigkeit der byzantinischen Zeit zu bestärken" (p. 296), adds that it is the main writing on this topic. But its miscellaneous character hurts his orderly, formal soul. "In dem Buche ist eine erhebliche Menge von Materialien zur Geschichte des Ueberganges vom heidnischen zum christlichen Kulturleben, zur griechischen Dogmatik, zur kirchlichen Poesie, Liturgie und Musik, selbst zur Etymologie, Numismatik, u. a. ausgeschüttet" (pp. 299, 300). But it should be remembered that, in spite of all that had been written, Sathas was a pioneer, and proof of a continuity of culture in any department strengthened the probability of the same continuity in every other department. Sathas himself had observed the illogical attitude of western writers before his time—his book was published at Venice in 1878—and his censure was prophetic of most that has been written since. He wrote: *Πάντες οἱ τοῦ νεωτέρου θεάτρου ἱστορικοὶ ἐπραγματεύθησαν τὸ θέμα ὑπὸ τὴν ἔποψιν ἐθνικῆς φιλοτιμίας· καὶ οἱ μὲν Γερμανοί, ἴσως δικαιότερον τῶν ἄλλων, διεκδικοῦσιν εἰς ἑαυτοὺς τὴν τιμὴν θεωροῦντες τὴν μοναχὴν* Hroswitha, *ἡγουμένην τῆς ἐν Βροῦνσβικ μονῆς* Gandersheim *ὡς μυσταγωγὸν τοῦ νεωτέρου θεάτρου, ἀπ' ἐναντίας δὲ οἱ Γάλλοι, οἱ Ἄγγλοι καὶ οἱ Ἰταλοὶ δι' ἄλλων ἐπιχειρημάτων προσπαθοῦσι νὰ οἰκειοποιηθῶσι τὸ τιμητικὸν πρωτεῖον· τὸ βέβαιον ὅμως ὅτι πάντες οἱ ἱστορικοὶ οὗτοι ἔκριναν σύμφερον ἵνα διαγράψωσι τοὺς Βυζαντινοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς θεατρικῆς πανδαισίας, παριστῶντες αὐτοὺς ὡς ἀμούσους καὶ ἀξέστους καλογήρους περὶ θεολογικὰς μόνον μικρολογίας κατατρίψαντας ὑπερχιλιέτη βίον. Ἀλλ' ἂν οἱ ἱστορικοὶ οὗτοι ἐμελέτων τὴν βυζαντινὴν ἱστορίαν, θὰ ἐπληροφοροῦντο ὅτι καὶ οἱ ἀτυχεῖς οὗτοι, καίτοι μὴ ἀναγνωρίζοντες τὸ θεάνθρωπον τοῦ Πάπα, οὐδὲν ἧττον ἦσαν ἄνθρωποι, μάλιστα δὲ μᾶλλον πεπολισμένοι καὶ ὀλβιώτεροι τῶν τότε λαῶν, ἐπομένως δὲν ἠδύναντο νὰ ζήσωσιν ἄνευ ἀνθρωπίνης θυμηδίας· ὡς προερρέθη καὶ θὰ ῥηθῇ λεπτομερέστερον παρακατίον, αὐτοὶ οἱ τοσοῦτον περιφρονούμενοι Βυζαντινοὶ οὐ μόνον ἐπὶ τοσαύτας ἑκατονταετηρίδας ἐτήρησαν τὰς θεατρικὰς τῶν προγόνων τῶν παραδόσεις, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρῶτοι ἐτόλμησαν ἵνα ἐκχριστιανίσωσι τὸ θέατρον πολὺ πρὸ τῆς Χροσβίτας καὶ τῶν ἄλλων διεκδικούντων τὴν τοιαύτην τιμήν. ιη', ιθ'.* Here he proceeds to show that almost the whole theatrical onomatology of the West is of Greek descent, including the words "theatre," "scene," "drama," the middle Latin

[1] "Marry, sir, sometimes he is a kind of a Puritan," etc.—*Twelfth Night*, Act II, sc. 3.

For fully three centuries Christianity[1] had to endure this double punishment, to see the faithful driven in crowds a sacrifice to the demon of heathenism, and then to know that all this vast self-devotion was greeted with malicious, artificial laughter. The words of St. Paul, "We are become a spectacle to the world, to angels, and to men," epitomized the history of nine generations of Christians. But in the midst of the degrading laughter of the people, the emperor usually the most prominent, there occurred often a startling scene, at first unexpected, in later years appalling from the very certainty of its recurrence—a scene which turned the comedy into a tragedy. The buffoon, who a moment before had been delighting the multitude by his antics, now clad in the robes of a Christian neophyte approaching the tank in

theano for a penny. Even such words as "theory," "theoretical" have a theatrical history and are accompanied in Byzantine Greek and mediaeval Latin by a cloud of cognates, while the verb "to joust," as in the mock battles of knighthood, may have been derived from the noun ἐξώστρα, a name applied to part of a theater by the Byzantines. The long and varied history of the words "tragedy" and "comedy" is more or less familiar, and it is perfectly plain that most of the definitions never grew out of ancient usage. Even if Sathas does roam rather widely in his study of words, he furnishes suggestive reading. But he also gives here and everywhere an indication of the real grievance against Byzantium, and that is the predominance of the church and of dogmatic discussion. One cannot go three steps in the study of anything Byzantine without the danger of breaking one's neck over a problem in ecclesiastical history. Finally, Krumbacher's complaint because a book which is a perfect encyclopaedia of recondite allusion is without an index, is just. No author has ever suffered more severely for his neglect on this point than has Sathas.

[1] Sathas, σελ. μβ'.

which his mock baptism was to take place, would stretch out his hands to the people, exclaiming "I am a true Christian." Sometimes the assemblage thought this a part of the play; but the repetition of such scenes and the frequent martyrdom of actors who refused to abjure their sudden confession affected the popular mind as something miraculous. Theodoretus, in eulogizing the martyrs, mentions particularly the converts drawn from the stage, and the synaxaries preserve the names of many such with biographical notices. In these personal histories ample and rational cause is shown for the aversion which Christianity had for the ancient theater. As the circus had long resounded with the cry "the Christians to the lions," so now in the streets and the basilica was heard the grim response: "the theater to the fire, the fire that burns forever." The contempt of the new age for the theater was so great, and on the whole so just, that even enthusiastic admirers of the Hellenic culture inveighed against the abominable orgies of pimps and hetaerae which disgraced the shades of Sophocles and Menander. Christian preachers waged relentless war against the stage, above all against the Hippodrome, and their censures were so pertinent that, after the church became established, by a curious irony of events the last great defender of heathenism, Emperor Julian, confessed himself as sincere a foe

of the popular theatrical exhibitions of his time as any Christian could be. He overcame this antipathy, in his more consuming hatred of Christianity, sufficiently to admit actors into his retinue, but never so far as to share the delight of his soldiers in a stage performance.

II

The triumph of Christianity abated in a measure for a time the animosity of Christian teachers toward the theater. At the time when Chrysostom was using all the powers of his oratory against every form of popular amusement, four men took the part of the proscribed drama. These were not common men; they were the leaders of their respective parties: Libanius, of the waning forces of idolatry, and Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, and Gregory Nazianzen, of the churches in Asia Minor.[1] The first was a polished advocate of Menander and of the comedy which had survived the vicissitudes of six centuries; the others, by their silence at least, resisted the fanaticism of Chrysostom, speaking against those practices only which were manifestly dangerous, not against all the traditional pastimes of the people. Gregory of Nyssa, without ever alluding to the theater at a moment when that was the main subject of controversy, restricted himself to showing that the national festival of

[1] Sathas, Αε'.

his country, celebrated as it was with heathen dances and wild orgies, was opposed to Christian tradition. His brother Basil followed much the same line, but with sharper attacks on the national festival; while Gregory Nazianzen, long known among the Greeks as the Orpheus of the church,[1] merely in an incidental way alluded with contempt to the stage. Finally, Basil the Great, having once for all shown the Cappadocians the destructive influence of the theater in other places, and in particular having instructed young people to avoid the shows of the jugglers, described the immoral character of the mythological stories favored in the drama of his time, and eloquently discriminated between the melodious singing of other days and the wretched performance of his contemporaries.

The reasons impelling Libanius to a defense of the stage are not far to seek. He felt instinctively that the theater was the last stronghold of the old religion, and he saw in the attack on the theater a menace to important practical interests of Syria. That country was then the nursery for the training of actors to supply the whole Roman empire. In the description of the world made for Constantius it was said of Syrian cities that Laodicea furnished the best charioteers; Tyre and Beirut, actors; Caesarea, pantomimists; Heli-

[1] Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, Vol. II, p. 412; Vol. III, p. 40.

opolis, choraulists; Gaza, declaimers; Ascalon, athletes; and Castavetia, rope-dancers. Aeneas Gazaeus much later boasted that Gaza was the Athens of Asia, and that young Athenians came there to finish their education. The explanation of the coolness and reticence with which the Cappadocian bishops treated the burning question of their day would be difficult to find, were it not known that all three were fond of the old Hellenic literature. Basil's assertion that Cappadocia was free from the immorality of the stage, is not to be taken literally. A fragment of the popular satirical poetry of the time shows how his comparative silence in the midst of the anti-theatric clamor was interpreted. He was there described in the character of a rhapsodist, with a green staff, symbol of his Homeric office, marching from Caesarea down to the capital and crooning an alphabetary, doubtless just the figure that many a Byzantine actor made in epic recitations.[1]

The apparent indifference of Chrysostom's three great contemporaries to the question which agitated

[1] Sathas, λη', λε' f., μη', μθ', ζε', τιβ':

Αγιος Βασίλης ἔρχεται ἀπὸ τὴν Καισαρεία,
βαστάει πένα καὶ χαρτί, χαρτὶ καὶ καλαμάρι·
τὸ καλαμάριν ἔγραφε καὶ τὸ χαρτὶ ἀναγνώνει.
Βασίλη μ' ποῦθεν ἔρχεσαι καὶ ποῦθε καταβαίνεις;
'Απὸ τὴ μάννα μ' ἔρχομαι, 'ς τὸν δάσκαλο παγαίνω,
πάγω νὰ μάθω γράμματα, νὰ μάθω καὶ τραγούδια·
ἐγὼ γράμματα ἔμαθα, τραγούδια νὰ σᾶς μάθω.
Καὶ 'ς τὸ ῥαβδὶ τ' ἀκούμπησε νὰ πῇ τ' ἀλφαβητάρι·
ξερὸ χλωρὸ ἦταν τὸ ῥαβδί, χλωροὺς βλαστοὺς πετάει,
κι' ἀπάνω 'ς τ' ἀκροβλάσταρα περδίκαια καρκαριῶνται,
δὲν εἶν περδίκια μοναχά, μόν' εἶν καὶ περιστέρια.

There are some tricks with words in these verses that will repay investigation.

him so intensely was no doubt owing partly to the difficulty which they foresaw of filling the vacancy that would be caused by the destruction of the theater. Zealots, indeed, quoted the New Testament advising those that were merry to sing psalms. A thousand years later the English Puritans and Scottish Presbyterians said much the same thing.[1] The Byzantines, being a light-hearted race, received this proposition with far less seriousness than did Shakespeare's fellow-countrymen. The obstinacy of the problem, if it moderated the zeal of the Basils and the Gregories, intensified the bitterness and radicalism of Chrysostom. He declared the Barbarians happy in that they had no theater. It is known now that he was wrong in this assertion, and that few tribes, even the most savage, are without some form of mimetic and scenic art.[2] But, right or wrong, his eloquence availed only with those who were already in sympathy with him. For the most part, the simplicity of his auditors was merely stupefied by his incessant thunder against what seemed to them harmless gaiety. Of course, there were abuses, but what then? These were not the theater. In short, the Byzantines could not conceive a world without plays; and, much as they loved their great rhetor, they not infre-

[1] H. A. Glass, *The Story of the Psalters*, pp. 2, 20.

[2] Tylor, *Primitive Culture*, Vol. I, pp. 285 f.; Müller, *Natural Religion*, pp. 399 f.; Tylor, *Anthropology*, pp. 233 f.

quently deserted him in a body when the alternative was between looking at a spectacle and listening to a sermon. Threats of excommunication, as Chrysostom saw for himself, were not only vain, but dangerous. His denunciations of the Satanic corruptions of the stage were felt to be overcharged, and as the churches of Constantinople were not the quiet, decorous places known to modern piety, he had often to withstand a storm of interruptions under which his congregation became a howling mob. Heated by opposition, he not only praised the Barbarians at the expense of Hellenic culture, but declared that Christianity must efface from the minds of the people even the familiar songs of childhood, the lullabies of nurses, the croonings of the women weavers, the chants of fishermen; for in all these lurked the thoughts of the old mythology.

The stage was, indeed, the visible representative of the old pagan life, and the reason why it survived so long was simply the steadfast adherence of the actors to their traditions and the warm affection felt for them by the common people, who, if they had wished, could not abandon the hereditary predilections for music and the theater confirmed by a thousand years of use. The congregations which at times deserted Chrysostom for the play were neither more nor less Christian on that account. They had imbibed the oriental

contempt for the actor in society; but, seeing him on the stage, they applauded him and voted him statues. In the moment of his triumph social and religious distinctions were forgotten, and hearts were subdued to his sway. True, these moments of abandon did not last; but they gave additional color to the somber view of the subject taken by Chrysostom. The Fathers, in their antagonism to the stage, saw what was not obvious to the multitude. They were scandalized by the music, the costumes, and even the hair of the actors. But these were not the main thing; nor did the preachers censure the actors as men, but rather as the instruments of an ancient enemy, namely, heathenism. Chrysostom knew well that it was impossible for the world to turn back. Consequently it must throw away every relic of the past which retarded the advancement toward the new ideals of civilization. If Chrysostom and his like thought that these new ideals were embodied in the church, they had reason. Greek mythology is rather a pretty thing for us. We hardly ever see its less charming aspects, and its horrors are veiled from all save those who investigate for themselves. But what has now to be sought had then to be forgotten.

One of the hard things to forget was the Phidian Zeus, of which it was said that without seeing it none could imagine what the deity was like, and

after seeing it none could imagine the deity otherwise than as Phidias represented him. That notion seems to have crept into the church occasionally, and it gave the ecclesiastical teachers such a fright as we can hardly realize, now that the long battle against idolatry has been won. Here is an illustration from a time much later than that of Chrysostom. A certain painter attempted to make a picture of Christ. But it was Zeus that he painted with a great head of hair, and the accursed hand which thus degraded the Savior was shriveled. The afflicted artist sought the aid of the patriarch Gennadius, in answer to whose earnest prayers the hand was restored to its normal power and function. But while Gennadius prayed that night in the altar-place he had a vision in which demons —all the pagan gods had become demons to the Christians of those times—cried out that they yielded to him, but that after his death they would rule the church. If those demons had been asked how they expected to conquer the church, they would have replied, by means of the stage. They could not have made any other answer in the legend of a Byzantine saint.

III

In his campaign against the theater, Chrysostom attacked with equal violence the Hippodrome, the Feast of the Calends, the wedding celebration, the popular songs, and every local festival in

which his keen eyes discerned a reminiscence of the old religion. The relation between the popular festival and the drama has been noteworthy always everywhere, though it has usually been misinterpreted in favor of the theory that the drama arose out of the festivals. If this theory were true, it is certain that other races in Asia and Europe would have had a drama as early as the Greeks, since they had, as a rule, festivals which were more dramatic in character than those of the Hellenes. The Germanic races had, in their sacrifices, May festivals, and summer and winter myth plays, better opportunity for spontaneous acting than the Greeks had in their Dionysia;[1] but at the time when they were still trying to harmonize as much of these as they could with their new religion, when their warriors were singing battle songs to their new hero, Christ, and their youths and maidens were singing love-glees in the churches, the Greeks not only did these things, but had their professional acting as well, and were as keenly alert to the difference between acting, on the one side, and popular semi-dramatic representation, on the other, as they had been in the best days of the Attic stage. The northern masquerade, forbidden in the ancient capitularies, even when it was shared by monks, nuns, and priests, retained manifest likeness to the symbolic

[1] Karl Pearson, on the German passion-play in his *Chances of Death and Other Studies*, Vol. II, p. 280.

masquerade of modern savages.[1] But the Greek masquerade was as devoid of this as a modern masque ball. In the time of Chrysostom the wedding in Byzantium was a true scenic performance,[2] the symbolism of which was exceedingly indirect. At the conclusion of the religious ceremony, the bride, going to the house of the bridegroom, was carried around the agora and through the streets with a numerous escort of friends and relatives, while the professional mimes who headed the procession sang epithalamia and represented little plays of courtship and marriage. In the Feast of the Calends of January, that is, of the New Year, there was the same sharp distinction between the general merry-making and the professional contributions of actors to the humor of the season. When everybody was acting a part, the theaters were deserted, and the actors, quitting the stage, distributed themselves about the city to entertain assemblages in the houses of the wealthy people. Processions of masquers were frequent, and among the traditional theatrical features of the season was a masque of death which is supposed to have corresponded, on the one hand, to practices mentioned by the classic poets and, on the other, to the mediaeval pageant called *chorea*

[1] Not to mention the examples usual under this head, certain anecdotes told by Ditmarus as supernatural stories (I, 7) may safely be credited to the theatrical tendencies of the half-christianized Saxon savages.

[2] Sathas, ἐς', ἐθ'.

Macchabaeorum and later the *danse macabre.*[1] Death was a favorite character in the mummery of the Middle Ages, as might be inferred from a well-known passage in *Don Quixote.*[2] In Bohemia, as late as the middle of the fourteenth century, not only the people but the priests took part in a procession which carried an image representing death to the nearest streams, with songs and superstitious performances, and there drowned the foe of the living.[3] While the Byzantine masque of death was doubtless varied from year to year, it was probably not unlike the elaborate torchlight procession of the carnival at Florence in the year 1510, when Death appeared seated on a wagon that was draped in black and ornamented with painted skulls and skeletons, attended by torch-bearers masqued with death's heads and followed by lines of people habited as corpses. Skeletons rising from open tombs sang dolefully, and musicians with muffled instruments added horror to the scene.[4] While it cannot be shown that the Florentines borrowed this lugubrious performance from Byzantium, yet the incident is worth noting in connection with other facts that will occur in their place.

[1] Douce, *Holbein's Dance of Death, passim*; Sathas, σελ. οζ', χορὸς τῶν Μακκαβαίων.

[2] Cervantes, *Don Quixote* (English translation), Part II, chap. XXXV.

[3] Loserth, *Hus und Wiclif*, p. 35; Pearson, *loc. cit.*, p. 283.

[4] Hawkins, *History of Music*, Vol. III, p. 444 (first edition).

Though the word "Calends" was believed by Latin etymologists, like Macrobius, to be of Greek origin,[1] yet the Greeks used nothing of the kind in their computation of time. The Roman origin of the festivities of the Calends of January is conceded by Maximus Planudes[2] in his discourse on the comparative merits of winter and spring. He writes as if he were defending the method of beginning the year in midwinter against a prejudice. It seemed to him that the Romans, the most famous and illustrious men of their times, not without earnest and wise thought fixed the beginning of the year in the winter and, to avoid clipping the month to suit the season, referred to the nearest subsequent new moon the annual feast and sacrifices. He names the January Calends and the customs usual at their recurrence as exemplifying his remarks. Polydore Vergil,[3] whose theory was that modern nations derived all their festivals from the Romans, after describing the ancient practices at the New Year, and comparing the dances and banquets mentioned by Vergil and Livy with those named and at the same time forbidden by Pope Zachary,[4] that the amuse-

[1] Macrobius, Bipontine edition, Vol. I, pp. 264, 273. Sathas cites the latter place, and also Varro, *De lingua Latina*, v, 4.

[2] Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, II, pp. 325 f.

[3] Polydore Vergil, *De inventoribus rerum*, lib. v, cap. ii. As the author is giving his own reminiscence mixed with his theories, one may say that the facts in the above passage date back to 1475 or 1480.

[4] In his letters to the Saxon missionary Boniface. The fourth question raised by the latter was as to the government of the three

ments of the season comprised games, hunts, wrestlings, courses with spears, horseraces, comedy recitations, and the representation in churches of the lives and martyrdom of holy persons, the latter being in the vernacular so as to be understood by all. He evidently described what he had himself witnessed, for he went on to tell what was done in his native Umbria on the eve of the Calends of March—the New Year's Day of the early Romans—in his time; that is, about 1500 A. D. The Greek Calandae and the Roman Saturnalia, not without leaving traces of antiquity, both gave way to a prolonged celebration of Christmas,[1] of which the Christian world still retains the more benevolent features. In Byzantium among Chrysostom's contemporaries there was profuse giving of gifts and an effacement for the time of all distinctions of rank. Polydore Vergil cites Justin to show that the ancient Romans already had this custom of equalizing masters and slaves at their Saturnalia, and then mentions the English among modern peoples as having most carefully preserved the ancient practice. The characteristics of this great festival, so largely an inheritance from classic times, were repeated more or less

dioceses which he had established on the Rhine: "Erat de Kalendis Januarii, de auguriis, phylacteriis, incantationibus et aliis observationibus, quas agebant gentili more in urbe Roma fieri." The reply of Zachary is indicated by Polydore Vergil in the previous note. See Natalis Alexandri *Historia ecclesiastica*, edition of Roncaglia and Mansi, XI, p. 10.

[1] Sathas, σελ. ο' ff., πδ'.

distinctly in the local festivals of various cities and provinces of the Eastern Empire, such as the Cleseis of Antioch, the Cappadocian Symposia, the Byzantine Cletoria, until this last degenerated into a banquet for the emperor and invited guests. The church succeeded in eliminating the most striking ethnic traits from these festivals as celebrated in the cities. But the country people long continued to celebrate the orgies of Bacchus in a way that might well have been approved even by the predecessors of Thespis. If pressed by the ecclesiastical power, they changed the name, but not the custom. In the thirteenth century the carnival of the West influenced the Byzantines, who translated the word into their language in the form Ἀποκρέω, and practically combined all their former feasts under this one title. The inclusion of the national symposia in this festival practically restored its Bacchic character, though the name was again changed to Κούλουμα. The inference from these particulars is obvious, that there never was a time throughout the Middle Ages when the West could not have refreshed its memory of these antique matters at the Byzantine stream of tradition and custom.

IV

Against the complete effacement of the Hellenic past advocated by Chrysostom, learning itself

united with the prejudices of the common people.[1] Christianity, in becoming the established religion of the empire, had forfeited a portion of its strength. Vast numbers of educated people were conformists only in name, without giving up their Hellenism. They witnessed, as a political necessity, with more or less apathy the destruction of the ancient temples; but they could not so easily give up customs which were endeared to them by the traditions of a thousand years. The opponents of the theater, not considering the void to be caused by its absence, hoped to satisfy the gay Hellenic spirit by means wholly Christian. In reality, they hastened the inevitable revenge of Hellenism. The sympathy of the merely conformist Christians for the persecuted stage was not limited to simple murmurings against the party of proscription. Two centuries after the final triumph of Christianity we still find schoolboys studying the ancient dramas under the guidance of their teachers, and sophists haranguing public audiences, and actors who were recognized professionally, and so must have been occupied with professional duties. The sophists, though Christian in name and addicted to the zealous discussion of topics in the Scriptures, nevertheless, frequently displayed a genuine hatred for the established religion. A reader of the speeches of Procopius and Choricius often doubts

[1] Sathas, σελ. πε', μγ'.

the Christianity of these men, when he sees in them such enthusiastic homage for the Olympian gods and Hellenic heroes. Their panegyrics were often delivered from the stage; as law teachers they regularly wore the characteristic robes of the play-house, resorted in company with their pupils to the places of amusement, and made the graduation of their students a theatrical performance. The last custom prevailed till the close of the seventh century, when it was definitely forbidden and anathematized by the Council in Trullo.[1]

The more daring of these sophists attempted even to write comedies against the religion enjoined on them by imperial decree. These comedies, if not publicly acted, yet had such notoriety as disquieted the living adherents of the faith and roused to activity the shades of the martyrs. Thus, a certain physician of Alexandria in the early part of the seventh century, who had been guilty of a comedy or two, baffled by an epidemic, besought the aid of Saints Cyrus and John. In a dream the saints revenged themselves on him as a playwright, and

[1] In 691 A. D., Sathas, σελ. σοβ', σογ', τλε', τμη', πζ', ριδ' ff.

Alexander Natalis, *Historia ecclesiastica*, Vol. X, 438: "Celebrata est haec Synodus in Trullo magni Palatii, id est, sub Regiae cupula vel lucerna." 442: "Canon XXIV. Clericos sub gradus sui et honoris periculo spectaculis scenicis, et agitationibus, aut cursibus equorum adesse vetat."—"Canon LI. Mimica spectacula, et scenicas saltationes, Clericis sub depositionis periculo, Laicis sub poena excommunicationis vetitos declarat." These were enactments of Iconoclasts, but were substantially re-enacted by the orthodox party and in that form were approved at Rome.

at the same time favored him as a physician by commanding him to bridle and saddle himself like an ass and to come thus accoutred to their church at midday. He carried out the injunction with literal exactness, and the epidemic abated. This doctor, Gesius or Gesus by name, was something of a wag. When baptized, as he had to be to save himself from the fanatics, he repeated from Homer this line: Αἴας ἐξαπόλωλεν, ἐπεὶ πίεν ἀλμυρὸν ὕδωρ.[1] He had received his literary education at Gaza and was a friend and a correspondent of the sophist Procopius. When his dramatic writings laid him under the suspicion of directing his satire against Christianity, Procopius condoled with him over the misfortunes of the stage in this fashion:

> How harsh against us are the decrees of fortune, a plot, indeed, for a dire tragedy! . . . . For this reason I admire the inventors of the tragic art, that seeing all ups and downs in the affairs of men, they anticipated all our complaints. What misfortune has befallen us or can befall us that was not long ago depicted to the very life?

Chrysostom's attack on the theater was, as we have seen, only partially successful. His own adherents recoiled when they saw the extremes to which he carried the controversy. The quarrel might have been allayed by a compromise, had it not been for an outbreak of heresy more alarming

[1] Mai, *Spicilegium Romanum*, Vol. III, pp. 303 f.

than any which had yet occurred in the history of the church. On all sides there was some search for points of agreement. The confessed adherents of the old religion admitted that there was reason in the censures of Christians upon the contemporary theater; and there were doubtless not a few such who on literary, moral, and religious grounds agreed with Themistius that the true remedy was the restoration of the ancient tragedy of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides. Isidore of Pelusium, generally a close follower of Chrysostom, gave moderate approval to the suggestion of Themistius; while Nilus, another of Chrysostom's disciples, plainly showed that it was the theater as it was, and not as it might be, that he condemned. It is the calamity of a bad age in literature, when it goes to the past for models, to take up those that are worthy of it. In the days of Nilus a favorite dramatic author was Philistion. It may be supposed that Nilus was actuated by religious prejudice when he wrote of the unmeasured meanness and evil-mindedness of the foolish Philistion; but we should remember that a critic whose predilections were all on the side of evil-mindedness, namely Martial, found this dramatist distasteful and characterized him tersely as the ridiculous Philistion. The actors of the day, in addition to performing the plays of this author, did much besides to keep up the contest with the church which others would

gladly have allayed. They had little to lose. The ancient stage as a place for personal distinction had been deprived of much of its luster in Christian Byzantium, environed as it was by the anathemas of priests and by oppressive laws on the part of the empire. The profession was consigned to ignominy by decrees which withheld the cheapest civil rights from those who belonged to it. The actor could not inherit property; he could not appear as a witness before the dicasteries, nor could he leave his occupation after he had adopted it. The church reluctantly granted him baptism and the Eucharist, and if possible left him to die without its consolations. If an actor abjured his vocation, he could be forced to resume it by the demands of the people, and the canons declared him excommunicate for his involuntary compliance. Living as he did upon the proceeds of a public fund, he was held a slave to the whims of the masses. Women who went on the stage were for centuries left without the protection of the law. They changed their names, usually taking some fanciful old Hellenic appellation.[1]

[1] For example: Lais, Rhodope, Glycera, Thalia, Rhodanthe, Euphronion, Thelxinoe, Bacche, Porphyris, Ariadne, Melissarion, Calliope, Bassaris, Galatea, Doris, Demo, Sappho, Chariclo, Margarito, Paphia, Menecratis, Theano, Cleophantis, Hermonassa, Helladia, Panarete, Rhodoclea, Ereutho, Libania, Chrysomallo, the last being a pet name, because it meant golden hair. But there seem also to have been some Christian names. These three—Maria, Theodoria, and Johanna—point to a development of the Christian drama which will be alluded to later. Besides, there is Theodora, the wife of Justinian;

Often the rage of a real or pretended lover brought upon them the disgrace of a shaven head, which drove them from their profession into the only other occupation open to them. This abuse was one of great antiquity, since it seems to be adverted to by Menander, and it remained unreformed until the time of Justinian. The compensation for all these miseries in the life of the actress was for many ages an ample income. Down to the reign of Theodosius the stage retained the privilege of lavish expenditure, and the emoluments of actresses were a consolation to feminine vanity that offset a host of discomforts. Under the successors of Theodosius, salaries were greatly reduced, and dress, which had formerly been unlimited, was now restricted by law. Still the costumes of the women of the stage remained the envy of other women, as the denunciations of Chrysostom clearly show. That the actresses set the fashion in Byzantium, as well as in many modern capitals, can be inferred from the history of many words relating to the art of the modiste which are still common in the Greek vocabulary.[1] As long as the actress could originate a mode so costly that only the rich could imitate it, she escaped the worst calamity of

and there is Antonina, her sister, who may have had a second name Cometo. These are the things in the history of the drama which a writer who fastens his eyes on books and the legitimate only is apt to miss.

[1] Sathas, σελ. ε' note.

her sex. Knowing the kind of language she must hear with becoming humility, if she sought admission to the church, she rarely became a convert. Chrysostom, while he was still in Alexandria, boasted of an actress who became a Christian under his preaching. But the most famous female convert was Margarito, a singer who was induced by Bishop Nonnus (probably identical with the collector of the Dionysiacs) to abandon the stage. She became a monk in Palestine under the name of Pelagius, and as a recluse kept the secret of her sex until her death. Evidently she must have been an ardent penitent; yet Nonnus addressed her as a courtesan whom the church could not allow to be baptized. In the imperial martyrology she was described by the word πόρνη, apparently with as little justice as time has shown to Mary Magdalene. It was doubtless just this severity of the ecclesiastics which the women of the stage dreaded and so long evaded. After their dress was limited by sumptuary laws, they had less and less temptation to resist these commands of the church. Those who still held out lost their former distinction. There came to be an almost complete identification, so far as words went, between the actress and her fallen sister. The mimad and the hetaera were looked upon as the same.

V

Under such conditions the people of the stage had, as remarked, nothing except their livelihood to lose. They were at the bottom of the ladder. Every advance in the authority of the church meant for them a step toward inevitable starvation. Sentiment and interest combined to hold them tenaciously to their old traditions.[1] The theater meddled as much in the politics of the cities and the empire as it dared. It satirized the characteristics and defects of its opponents; nor did its enemies fail to give it material for satire, as the controversy widened and took in all sorts of extraneous questions. Thus the quarrel between Gregory of Nazianzen, when he became patriarch, and Maximus, the so-called Cynic of Alexandria, was ridiculed in a farce. The dispute of the two bishops, Severianus and Antiochus, before Chrysostom was also parodied on the stage; and it may well be supposed that, when these two prelates, who stood well at the imperial court, were satirized, Chrysostom, the enemy of the empress as well as of the theater, was not allowed to escape. In attacks of this sort upon prominent churchmen the actors could be sure of the smiles and sympathy of factions within the church itself. Moreover, there were even bishops who supported the cause of the theater as it was with all its

[1] Sathas, νδ', νε', η', σγ', σδ', σκη', σμζ', κγ', ρμς', τνς'.

paganism, and one of these is said to have written a play in which he introduced Dionysus with ivy, cissus, wine, and the scandalous Bacchantic procession, all complete. That such a composition by a Christian bishop was deemed possible in an age of bitter controversy shows the hold still maintained by the theater on the minds of men in general.

The great heresiarch Arius was well aware of the affection felt by the people who spoke Greek for the Hellenic literature and for the theater, and he endeavored to enlist this feeling on the side of Christianity by making his church service Hellenic and theatrical. His purpose was manifest in the principal liturgic work used by his followers, which he wrote himself and entitled *Thalia*, the name of the muse of comedy. Unfortunately, few fragments of the *Thalia* have escaped the vigilant hatred of orthodoxy, and these reach us mainly through writings inimical to the book and its author. Athanasius originated the charge that Arius imitated the licentious Alexandrian playwright Sotades[1]—him who was drowned for making scurrilous jests on Ptolemy Philadelphus—and described the *Thalia* as containing, in addition to hymns, also a programme for a pantomimic dance in memory of the crucifixion. The Arians had many hymns which they divided

[1] Athanasius, *Opera* (Paris, 1698), Vol. I, pp. 247, 277, 290, 406, 408, 409, 505.

into three classes—sailor's hymns, miller's hymns and wayfarer's hymns; as if intended for the edification of these different groups of people; or, more likely, copied from songs which were already traditional among them. The meager discussion reminds one of the "chanties" of modern sailors, the miller's song in games of children, and of what is said about pilgrim's chants in the Middle Ages. It is necessary to keep in mind the fact that whatever we know of Arius comes from writers more or less hostile to him. Scanty as the information is about the Arian theatrical hymnology, we are assured that to it alone was due the enormous spread of a heresy which captivated all the barbarians of the West, and prepared Asia Minor for the advent of Mohammed. More than this, Arianism created, or at least revolutionized the singing of the orthodox Christians, both east and west. The great popularity of the *Thalia* convinced its more obstinate critics of the utility of the devices embodied in it, and an early result was a book entitled *Antithalia.* In the popular sense, as distinguished from the ecclesiastical tradition, the church in Alexandria was the first to introduce singing into liturgy. The practice spread to Palestine, Libya, Arabia, Syria, Cappadocia, and Constantinople forthwith, and soon, it may be added, to the religious centers of the West. It is a coincidence worthy of note that the hymnol-

ogy of the Latin church began in the midst of the Arian controversy, with Hilary of Poitiers,[1] whose struggle against the heresy was, if anything, more bitter than that of the eastern bishops. He was at one time driven from his see and was obliged to take refuge among the oriental Christians in Phrygia. It was in Asia that his first hymns appear to have been written. They were not composed for the public service of the churches, though they soon found a place in it, but for the consolation of his daughter Abra. In this fact may be divined the caution of the Gallic bishop on taking up a custom which was popular but novel among the Christians of the East.

Apparently this new custom was not unlike that of various religious poets in modern times who, to keep the devil from having all the good tunes, adapted devout words to airs from the dance-houses and the streets. It is well known that Clement Marot's translations of the Psalms, so much in vogue at the court of Henry II that all persons of note, including the king himself, chose each some psalm as a favorite, were adapted to secular melodies of a very pronounced character. The most amusing feature of the Reformation in Scotland, at least viewed historically, was the composition of "gude and godly ballates changed out

[1] Duffield, *Latin Hymns*, pp. 19 ff., March, *Latin Hymns*, p. 217; Manitius, *Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Poesie bis zur Mitte des 8. Jahrhunderts*, pp. 101 ff.

of prophaine songs, for avoiding of sinne and harlotrie." About the same time the same practice obtained in Holland and England, and was still earlier known in Italy. It has since been followed very generally by those who set hymns to music, without a suspicion of heresy unless the words themselves were questionable. One of the most curious specimens of this borrowed art in English is a still extant religious parody of the ballad of "The Nut-Brown Maid."[1]

It soon happened in Byzantium that Arians and Christians could be heard singing the same melody, but to different words. There were riots and broken heads and murders, but still the popular singing went on more loudly than ever. It was warmly approved by Basil and by Chrysostom; almost its only irreconcilable opponents were the hermits who thought that it savored of Hellenism. The hermits and the monks in general up to this period, and for some time afterward, were in the habit of chanting or singing hymns similar to those in use among the Jewish Therapeutae. Between the reactionary Judaism of the cenobites and the crass Hellenism of the Arians, orthodoxy strove to keep a middle course. But popular sacred songs led to other theatrical innovations, as indicated in a sermon of Chrysostom on the Eucharist, where he says:

[1] Glass, *The Story of the Psalters*, pp. 4 ff.

If we come with faith, we shall see him lying in the manger, *for this table represents the arrangement of the manger;* and here will lie the body of the Master, not now in swaddling-bands, as then, but clothed in the Holy Spirit. The initiated know what I mean.

St. Amphilochus—we are bound to believe reverently—called the miracles of Christ comedies. Basil spoke of the Song of Songs as an ode dramatically expressed, and the Apamaean Polychronius prepared it for representation as an allegorical play or morality with the following cast of characters: Bridegroom, Our Lord; Bride, the Church; Friends of the Bridegroom, Angels and Saints; Companions of the Bride, the Followers of the Church. The idea embodied in this curious play was long afterward taken up in the West. Nobody who has read much of Bossuet will credit him with an idea really original. He was a master of amplification; no detail escaped him in working out a thought, but the germ was the output of another mind. So it is to be imagined that in this case he had in memory either Greek or mediaeval Latin authority, when he developed the conception of the Song of Songs as a wedding drama. Lowth, it is well known, followed him in this theory, and modern critics generally seem to accept it, though most of them would divest the poem of the ecclesiastical allegory shown in the redaction of Polychronius. A few

generations after Chrysostom and Basil the theatrical tendency was so potent in the church that the hymn-writer Romanus[1] composed a poem on the birth of Christ:

in which there is first an account of the nativity and its accompanying wonders, and then a dialogue between the wise men, the Virgin Mother, and Joseph. The Magi arrive, are admitted, describe the moral and religious condition of Persia and the East, and the cause and adventures of their journey, and then offer their gifts. The Virgin intercedes for them with her son, instructs them in some parts of Jewish history, and ends with a prayer for the salvation of the world.

In short, Romanus invented a complete mystery five centuries before anything of the kind was known to the ecclesiastics or artisans of the West.

VI

Under the successors of Constantine, and particularly in the times of his son Constantius, Arianism, flowing out from Alexandria, overspread all Anatolia with such rapidity that it seemed likely to pervade the whole empire. If

[1] Meursius, *Opera*, ed. Lamii, Vol. VIII, p. 213, cited also by Sathas. Bossuet, *Commentary on the Song of Songs*, preface; Lowth, *Poetry of the Hebrews*, Lecture XXX. Renan's introduction to his translation of Canticles is one of the most thoroughgoing efforts to explain the work as a purely secular drama. Baeda's commentary shows how completely from the outset the allegorizing interpretation was worked into the learning of the West. For Romanus see the Earl of Selborne's essay *Hymns*, p. 28. E. Bouvy, quoted by Krumbacher, p. 317, says of Romanus: "Ses œuvres représentant l'hymne liturgique, ou plûtot *le drame religieux* dans sa perfection."

the ancient psalmody of the church had remained unchanged hitherto, it would now have been overwhelmed by a revolution which temporarily reversed the processes of Christian history.[1] It is very doubtful, however, if the music known to the apostles had been accurately handed down by tradition. The church in Antioch was, indeed, distinguished for the use of what was called the Davidic melodia—a manner of singing the Psalms of David according to rules wholly different from those of Greek music. But Theodore of Mopsuestia, who had heard the older singing of the church in Antioch and had been trained by a teacher to whom that more ancient practice was familiar, spoke with contempt of the so-called Davidic melody as in the contemporary Syrian style and not to be compared with the apostolic tradition. The emperor Julian described the Syrian music as not only foreign, but irrational, while Xanthopulus pointed out that the music of the churches in Syria at this time was largely borrowed from the Gnostics. But this appears to have been due to the enthusiasm of two or three individuals rather than to any popular movement. Bardesanes,[2] a famous Gnostic of the third cen-

[1] All the church histories can be cited on this point.

[2] Sathas, ρλ' ff., ρλθ'—where is quoted this passage from Ephrem: *Τίς ἐκ πάντων τούτων δύναται ἀποδεῖξαι ὅτι ἁρμόζει χριστιανοῖς κιθαρίζειν, ἢ ὀρχεῖσθαι, ἢ βαλλίζειν, ἢ χοραυλεῖν, ἢ ἐπιφρονεῖν. . . . . Ποία Γραφὴ μακαρίζει τοὺς αὐλοῦντας, ἢ κιθαρίζοντας, ἢ τοὺς γελῶντας, ἢ τοὺς τρυφῶντας καὶ μεθύοντας, ἢ τοὺς βαλλίζοντας καὶ ὀρχουμένους; . . . . Εἰ ποτε κηρυχθῇ νηστεία ἢ*

tury, was an innovator, not only in religion, but in music. He is said to have created a new style of singing in Syria, and his son, Harmonius, by devising a system of notation to have made it permanent. It is probable that there were folk-elements in the new system; at least, it caught the ear of the people. Ephrem Syrus,[1] the orthodox hymn-writer, adapted poems doctrinally correct to the fashionable melodies. Thus, it appears that the movement in a direction which was neither Jewish nor Hellenic had begun before Arius attempted his reform. A curious feature of this Syrian musical efflorescence was the formation of women choirs, not in the churches, of course, but in religious houses. One composer Auxentius, established a house for women, in which his melodies were to be sung, and a great number of the women who followed him appear to have been professional singers who had wearied of the theater. All these anterior facts considered, it may be that the preference of Arius for theatrical music was the result of a tendency common in his time, and not his individual vagary. Nevertheless, he got the blame for it all. After him the words

ἀγρυπνία πτοοῦνται πάντες καὶ ἀποδύρονται καὶ ὡς νεκροὶ γίνονται, ἐὰν δὲ μηνυθῇ ποτε ἄριστα, ἢ δεῖπνα, ἢ κιθάραι, ἢ ᾄσματα δαιμονικά, πάντες ὑλαροὶ γίνονται, εὔδρομοι καὶ ἐγρήγοροι, καὶ ἀλλήλοις προσφωνοῦσι καὶ συντρέχουσι τὸν κακὸν δρόμον καὶ ἀγωνίζονται τὸν ἐλεεινὸν ἀγῶνα. *Sancti Ephraemi opera*, Vol. III, pp. 52, 381, 383—a passage which bristles with words to a Greek ear associated with the theater. See also Sathas, σκ', σπθ', σιβ', ρκθ', σζα' ff.

[1] See the histories of music.

"theatrical" and "heretical" were synonymous in the writings of orthodox churchmen. Arianism became universally known as the thymelic heresy, and the writings of its advocates were called thymelic books.

The process by which the church involuntarily absorbed certain elements of stage art was not the only way in which the theater was affiliated with its ancient enemy. The theaters of Alexandria were the scene, under the reign of Theodosius the Younger, of various incidents which caused them to be mentioned by historians. They were then, as they had been in the days of Dio Chrysostom, three centuries before, the dominant factor in a city which breathed tumult and sedition and rioted in racial and religious hatreds. The national religious ceremonies of the hellenized Egyptians often took place in the theaters. This led on one occasion to an uprising of the Jews against the desecration of the sabbath and to the murder of Hypatia. The fact that the Alexandrians spent most of their time in the theater brought on a state of affairs in which the emperor himself acted as conciliator between the church and the play-going multitudes. In the midst of a severe winter he advised the people to leave their amusements and attend the churches in the hope of mitigating the hardships of the season. When this suggestion was disregarded in spite of the increasing misery

caused by the weather, he proclaimed services in the theaters themselves, thus turning the whole city into a church. The importance of this achievement can be understood only when it is considered that the quarrel between the church and the theater was actually a contest between rival religions. By the efforts of Theodosius, the God of the church was worshiped in the haunts of Dionysus. Theodosius is not credited with the foresight shown in this strategic victory for the new religion. The plan is attributed to the empress Eudocia, the daughter of an Athenian philosopher, educated in all the learning of her time, and a convert to Christianity who still cherished her Hellenic traditions. Her aspirations toward a reconciliation of the theater and the church went further than merely to beguile multitudes of pleasure-seekers into performing an act of worship. To her is attributed an imperial decree of great significance in dramatic history. An appeal had been made to her in behalf of the historic seat of Apollo at Delphi against the enforced contribution to the theatrical funds of the imperial capital. In spite of the legend that Apollo was formally dispossessed on the day of the crucifixion, he still retained a measure of his old popularity. Julian rehabilitated the oracle and it continued to subsist, not upon its ancient revenues—for those had long been sequestrated—but probably upon the offer-

ings of that rural and pagan Hellas outside of the great cities, which stubbornly resisted the advance of Christianity. Gifts from such a source must have been meager compared with the inflowing wealth of ages past. They sufficed, however, to attract the notice of the imperial financiers, who levied a tax on Delphi for the spectacles in Constantinople. Soon after the marriage of Eudocia this impost was abolished. Christians were scandalized by the courtesy to Apollo and threatened reprisals, whereupon the decree was made universal, all the Hellenic cities being allowed to retain the whole of their theoric fund for their own theaters. The inference is that they all had theaters, and that means something very different from the Circus at Rome or the Hippodrome at Constantinople. In short, at the moment when the ecclesiastics recognized the persuasive influence of theatrical music, the secular power began to discriminate in favor of the genuine Hellenic stage as compared with the Graeco-Roman aggregation of games. Theodosius gave another proof of his affection for the provincial stage, when an earthquake devastated Nicomedia, by causing to be rebuilt at the expense of the state, not only the churches, but also the theaters of that city.

It was unfortunate that such measures as those of Theodosius and Eudocia, the intention of which was solely to relieve and benefit the true drama, be-

came by the mere obliquity of the times a source of strength to the Hippodrome. Ecclesiastical scruples having been overcome with respect to the legitimate theater, ecclesiastical human nature, of course, gradually aligned itself with the populace, favored chariot-races and farces, and imitated the manners of the great imperial show-place. In the time of the emperor Marcian the assimilation between the church and the Hippodrome became so close that it was not always easy to distinguish the plays of the one from the solemnities of the other. A parallel between the so-called *acta* of the Prasini or the Beneti in the Hippodrome and the so-called *practica* of the councils, for example, those which condemned Nestorius and Eutyches, shows that in a literary sense they were copies of the same model. The imperial decrees were read in the council as in the Hippodrome, the secretary interrupting the reading at definite intervals to allow the assembled bishops and monks to applaud the emperor in a set form of words—precisely the same words as those used in the Hippodrome for the like purpose. This form of words as it appears in the pages of the ecclesiastical historians, who had only a limited knowledge of Byzantine customs, seems a novelty; but it was such, if at all, only in the church. That these *practica* were intoned in the churches by the people divided into choruses is to be inferred from the remark that the popular

enthusiasm over the condemnation of the heretics (Nestorius, etc.) was so great that the congregations, after repeating what the council had prepared, supplemented it by singing antiphonally sentences from the gospels. This manner of hailing the emperor continued unchanged in the Hippodrome until the capture of Constantinople by the Latins. Even so late as the end of the iconoclastic controversy, the *practica* of the councils were still burdened with the formal cries of the Hippodrome intoned by grave and reverend prelates under the leadership of the patriarch himself.

VII

The history of the ecclesiastical theater of the Byzantines is almost ignored; yet it is none the less remarkable.[1] Its earliest dramas are found in works of the poet and musician Romanus, one of which has already been cited. It is significant that Romanus rose to fame at a moment when the drama had just emerged from one of the most miserable periods in its history. Leo the Isaurian, and his successor Zeno, while they tolerated the Hippodrome, endeavored to destroy the more characteristic theater of the Greeks, which Theodosius and Eudocia had sought to encourage. They were urged to the most radical measure by the extreme party in the church. But the fanatics

[1] Sathas τνς'ff., ιβ', τοϑ'. ρπγ', σνβ', τοα', τογ', τοε', τοη', τπγ'.

saw no improvement. In a hagiography of the period it was said, with a curious exaggeration of credulity, that the statues of the silent stage turned to demons to torment good Christians; but further, with more probability, that the mimads, deprived of their professional livelihood, became women of the town. The saint who is supposed to have lived in the time of Leo, is quoted as saying prophetically that the next emperor would continue the proscription of the stage, but that after him would come Antichrist in the form of an actress, Mondion by name, who would reopen the theaters and vex the church with wicked song. The prophecy came true in a way. Leo's successor, Zeno, kept the theaters closed; but the next emperor, Anastasius, was devoted to Hellenic traditions. He fostered the theaters, patronized actors, and according to the church writers, combined all the heresies either in his own person or in his nearest relatives. His mother favored the Manichaeans, her brother the Arians, and Anastasius, the rest, including Acephalians and Eutychians. He stopped the persecution of the Arians and allowed the few of them who survived to meet and worship in their own way, as long as they refrained from public declamations against the established religion. Even his enemies acknowledged that he respected and conserved the rights of the church. It was the good fortune of

Romanus to live and write under this generous emperor. With the guidance of such a poet and such a statesman, the new dramatic impulses were not permitted to take the place of what was ancient. On the contrary, the nascent ecclesiastical theater looked upon itself as the legitimate offspring of the Hellenic stage. Its most popular hymns were often bold imitations of verses which the heathen poets, particularly Euripides, had addressed to the gods of the old temples. The development of this new drama reflects the attitude of the long-lived theatrical tradition toward the steadfast hatred of the orthodox church. In the great contest which lasted more than a thousand years, there grew up as antagonistic to the ancient poetry, the rhythmic *prosa*, and the two classes alternated according to the ecclesiastical disposition with reference to classic art. Such a contest, it would seem, might be carried on without heat. But, in fact, bigots irritated themselves as easily in a dispute over the comparative merits of quantitative and accentual verse as over any other question, especially when prosody became entangled with church customs and religious prejudice. The Iconoclast emperors, warm adherents of the ancient stage, burned the liturgic dramas of the orthodox melodi; the fathers of the council which met in Nicaea not only burned but anathematized the songs of the heretics. The purely literary phase

of the controversy was reflected afterward in the West. Germany—that is the Germany of the Hellenophile Saxon emperors—was the home, if not the starting-point, of the *prosa* in its most extreme form, the "sequence," so-called from the position to which it was relegated in the service. But in Italy, which hated Byzantium, and at every glimmer of an educational revival reverted to the Latin classical tradition, very few sequences were written, and these at a late date; and the influence of Italy sufficed in the end to banish them almost entirely from the ritual.[1]

The liturgic drama was intimately connected with the *acta* of the people—that is, the folk-play of the Hippodrome—in which were preserved the fragmentary traditions of the ancient stage, though not its literature. The people in the Hippodrome were clad in theatrical robes, and were divided into choruses which, under the lead of the orchestra, sang the laudations in honor of the emperor. The name for these performances, borrowed from the

[1] The whole nomenclature of the science used in the construction of tropes and sequences is against those (Gautier, *Histoire de la poésie liturgique au moyen âge: les tropes* [Paris, 1886], *passim;* or Frere, *The Winchester Tropes from MSS of the Xth and XIth Centuries; with Other Documents Illustrating the History of Tropes in England and France* [London, 1894], who wish to leave the lay reader under the impression that these amplifications of the liturgy originated in the West of Europe.

• As to the date and region of the sequence without words, the theory of Gautier that it originated in northern France is well supported by evidence. Still the historians of music all agree that the practice of wordless carols is found in all ages and among all nations.

Latin, implied that they had been written out and submitted to the approval of the autocrat before they were sung in public. However, they were often exploited without his approval, and this gave an opportunity for satire against officials and courtiers in which not even the emperor was always spared, as the great Justinian himself had reason to know. Naturally this privilege of laughing maliciously at those in power was dear, not only to the actors but to the populace. Nevertheless, the antitheatrical party in the church did not abandon the hope of destroying the last remnant of heathenism. In the time of Justinian II the attack on the theater was renewed with implacable severity. The result was not what the fanatics desired; on the contrary, the dynasty was overthrown, and orthodoxy itself became for two centuries and a half a despised heresy. The people and the stage were the most efficient instruments of the Iconoclasts, heaping derision, as they did, on the so-called idolators, and satirizing the monks in the Hippodrome. The whole controversy became, indeed, a great scenic drama. The Council in Trullo[1] forbade the

[1] Τὰς οὕτω λεγομένας Καλάνδας καὶ τὰ λεγόμενα Βοτὰ καὶ τὰ λεγόμενα Βρουμάλια καὶ τὴν ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τοῦ Μαρτίου μηνὸς ἡμέρᾳ ἐπιταλουμένην πανήγυριν, καθ' ἅπαξ ἐκ τῆς τῶν πιστῶν πολιτείας περιαιρεθῆναι βουλόμεθα· ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ τὰς τῶν γυναίων δημοσίας ὀρχήσεις, καὶ πολλὴν λύμην καὶ βλάβην ἐμποιεῖν βουλομένας· ἔτι μὴν καὶ τὰς ὀνόματι τῶν παρ' Ἕλλησι ψευδῶς ὀνομασθέντων θεῶν, ἢ ἐξ ἀνδρῶν καὶ γυναικῶν γινομένας ὀρχήσεις καὶ τελετὰς κατά τι ἔθος παλαιὸν καὶ ἀλλότριον τοῦ τῶν χριστιανῶν βίου ἀποπεμπόμεθα ὁρίζοντες μηδένα ἄνδρα γυναικείαν στολὴν ἐνδιδύσκεσθαι, ἢ γυναῖκα τὴν ἀνδράσιν ἁρμόδιον· ἀλλὰ

teachers of law to visit the stage or to wear theatrical robes. Theatric songs were banished from the churches; the faithful under penalty of excommunication, were enjoined from attending any of the ancient festivals—the Calandae, the Brumalia, the Vota, the Lupercalia, or the Dionysia; the Hippodrome was condemned, and the setting-up of scenic statues in public places was prohibited. Not only did the ecclesiastics endeavor to abolish the popular festivals, but they also strove to exclude the actors from all wedding festivities, thus marring one of the dearest feminine privileges in the social life of Constantinople. The council was thoroughly consistent. It refused to allow its own *practica* to be chanted according to the usual custom, undoubtedly for the reason that the custom was theatrical. No effort was made by the ecclesiastics in this council to discriminate between drama and spectacle. The mimes, whom Justinian had tacitly favored, were now condemned in the same sentence with the shows of the Cynegia. In fact, it was paganism which the council sought to destroy, and it followed this hated enemy into

μήτε προσωπεῖα κωμικὰ ἢ σατυρικὰ ἢ τραγικὰ ὑποδύεσθαι, μήτε τοῦ βδελυκτοῦ Διονύσου τὰ ὀνομα τὴν σταφυλὴν ἀποθλίζοντας ἐν τοῖς ληνοῖς ἐπιβοᾷν, μηδὲ τὸν οἶνον ἐν τοῖς πίθοις ἐπιχέοντας γέλωτα ἐπικινεῖν, ἀγνοίας τρόπῳ ἢ ματαιότητος τὰ τῆς δαιμονιώδους πλάνης ἐνεργοῦντας. Τοὺς οὖν τοῦ νῦν τι τῶν προειρημένων ἐπιτελεῖν ἐπιχειροῦντας, ἐν γνώσει τούτων καθισταμένους, εἰ μὲν Κληρικοὶ εἶεν, καθαιρεῖσθαι προστάσσομεν, εἰ δὲ λαϊκοί, ἀφορίζεσθαι. Canon 62, quoted by Sathas, p. *τοα'*, n. 3. Other canons are also quoted near by; but this one suffices to show that the members of a council at the close of the seventh century understood all varieties of the drama to be still in common use.

every hiding-place. It forbade Christians to use the names of pagan gods in oaths; to depict Christ in the form of a lamb; to offer milk and honey on the altars of the churches; to light bonfires in honor of the new moon; to have horse-races or any public spectacle in the time of the Paschal festival; to give banquets in the name of charity in the churches. The canons adopted show, taken together, the insidious abuses which had to be combated as long as a single entrance was left open to the spirit of the old religion, from which the Greeks, as a race, had been converted only in name. It would have been fortunate for the Eastern Empire and for the world if the proposed reforms had been universally accepted. But the result was the renewal of disorders in the Hippodrome, the further alienation of the Latin church, which had learned to temporize with latent heathenism rather than to make it notorious by formal attacks, and the development of the Iconoclastic controversy. Around this vast ecclesiastical maelstrom eddied little circles of eccentric religionists —ascetics who performed dances with women in imitation of Israel on the shores of the Red Sea; and, most curious of all, the sect of the Unbended Knee, the members of which prayed standing, throwing their arms about in accordance with a form prescribed for expelling demons from the circumambient atmosphere.

Iconoclasm recognized its affinity for those earlier revolts from orthodoxy which had been more or less affiliated with the stage. It appealed in particular to a book called *The Journeys of the Apostles*, which had been in existence ever since the close of the second century, for historical proof of the fact that icons were condemned by the traditions of the early Christians. The reference was to a fragment of the legend of St. John the Evangelist, alluding to a portrait of the apostle said to have been drawn by a painter named Lycomedes. The artist reverenced his own work very highly on account of the subject. He prayed before it, and in general acted as if it possessed for him a peculiar sanctity. The apostle, who had never seen the reflection of his own features, asked Lycomedes who it was to whom he paid so much respect, whereupon the artist held up a mirror. John gazed intently, compared the reflection with the picture, confessed that the portrait was a true one, but insisted that Lycomedes had done very wrong in making it. Another tale in the legend of St. John[1] was that shortly before the arrest, trial, and crucifixion in Jerusalem, Jesus called his disciples to him and sang a hymn, to which they responded in chorus, dancing in a circle about him. Though this curious and ancient hymn was

[1] R. A. Lipsius, *Die apokryphen Apostelgeschichten und Legenden: Ein Beitrag zur altchristlichen Literaturgeschichte* (Braunschweig, 1883), Vol. I, p. 443.

of Gnostic origin, it may be said to dispose of the theory advocated by some that the theatric element of early Christianity was introduced by the Teutonic races.[1] It is not the only specimen of its kind in the apostolic legends, luxuriantly fantastic and incredibly fictitious. The expulsion of demons, the raising of the dead, miracles of healing, and punishment were endlessly multiplied. Constant repetition of similar wonderful occurrences, which the most fertile invention could vary but little, gave the narrative a monotony which could only be relieved by conversations, hymns, and prayers. These, by way of compensation, were often of high poetic merit. Besides the rich apparatus of miracles, visions, angelic apparitions, heavenly voices, speaking beasts and statues, abashed demons confessing their impotence, and magicians and sorcerers appealing to the powers of the air; supernatural brightness lighted the scene, myste-

[1] Lipsius, *op. cit.*, p. 526. *Δόξα σοι πάτερ. ἀμήν. δόξα σοι λόγε, δόξα σοι χάρις. ἀμήν. δόξα σοι τὸ πνεῦμα, δόξα σοι ἅγιε, δόξα σου τῇ δόξῃ. ἀμήν. αἰνοῦμέν σε, πάτερ, εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι φῶς, ἐν ᾧ σκότος οὐκ οἰκεῖ. ἀμήν. ἐφ' ᾧ δὲ εὐχαριστοῦμεν, λέγω. σωθῆναι θέλω καὶ σῶσαι θέλω. ἀμήν. λυθῆναι θέλω καὶ λύσαι θέλω. ἀμήν. τρωθῆναι θέλω καὶ τρῶσαι θέλω. ἀμήν. γενηθῆναι θέλω καὶ γεννᾶν θέλω. ἀμήν. φαγεῖν θέλω καὶ βρωθῆναι θέλω. ἀμήν. νοῦς ὢν ὅλος. ἀμήν. λούσασθε θέλω καὶ λούειν θέλω. ἀμήν. ἡ χάρις χορεύει, αὐλῆσαι θέλω, ὀρχήσασθε πάντες. ἀμήν. θρηνῆσαι θέλω, κόψασθε πάντες. ἀμήν.* This differs somewhat from the reading given by Sathas. Lipsius emphasizes, perhaps unconsciously, in various places the dramatic quality of these Gnostic legends. See pp. 7 ff. in particular. For the "Descent of the Soul" or "Hymn of the Soul," see pp. 292-300; for the epithalamium, particularly pp. 301-3. For the remark about the Teutonic races, see Karl Pearson, "The German Passion Play" in *Chances of Death, and Other Studies in Evolution*, Vol. II, p. 280.

rious signs shimmered in the heavens; earthquakes, thunder, and lightning affrighted the impious; fire, earth, wind, and water were ordained to the service of the righteous; serpents, lions, leopards, tigers, and bears were tamed by the apostles at a word and taught to turn their wrath against the persecutors; dying martyrs were surrounded by shining aureoles, with garlands of roses and lilies and wonderful fragrance, while the abyss opened of itself to swallow their enemies. The devil, who usually appeared in the form of an Ethiopian, and demons of the most varied figure, played a significant part in these stories. Preference above all was shown for the visionary elements of fiction. Christ appeared to his followers, sometimes as a lovely boy, sometimes as a sailor, as a herdsman, or in the form of an apostle. The martyr saints returned to life in order to show themselves, sometimes to their converts, sometimes to their persecutors. In dreams and visions the believers were warned of their predestined fate, and devout heathen were apprised of the coming of a new faith. One of the most fantastic theatric features of the apostolic legends is the detail of the martyrdom of St. Peter, in which that apostle, though crucified head downward, appeared to the faithful as if he were upright. Again, the cloud which concealed Thecla in one legend and Mariamne in another was not unknown

to the stage. Among the very ancient Gnostic hymns which showed dramatic form were the description of the descent of the soul into the body under the similitude of the wanderings of a king's son in the land of Egypt, and St. Thomas' ode to Wisdom as daughter of Light, the latter being a complete epithalamium.

Not only did the Iconoclasts accept this book of apostolic legends with all its dramatic suggestion, they also took the popular side on the question of preserving theatrical amusements. All the ethnic festivals before condemned by the Council in Trullo were now celebrated by them with the ancient pomp, the emperors themselves presiding, while the actors with voice and cithara performed the music of the Brumalia and the Dionysia. It is possible that the complaisance of the emperors was dictated more by policy than by any enthusiasm for old customs. The Brumalia, involving as they did the scattering of immense sums in gold as largess to the people, could have been enjoyable only to those who received the gift, not to him who had to waste thus a declining revenue. For the festival lasted four and twenty days, one for each letter of the Greek alphabet. It was an auspicious season for the beggar-literati,[1] since poetical and rhetorical exhibitions were numerous; and it was no wonder that they traced its origin

[1] Neumann, *Die Weltstellung des byzantinischen Reiches*, pp. 21, 22, where he also cites Tomaschek, *Ueber Brumalia und Rosalia.*

to Romulus. After the restoration of orthodoxy, the experiment of abolishing the Brumalia was made by Romanus I, Lacapenus, but the clamor against his decree was loud and angry; it was impossible for the populace to see how anyone could venture to strike down a custom which the great Theodosius and Justinian approved, and which furnished a livelihood to a multitude of people. In fact, resentful as they might be toward the theater and its cognate festivals, the partisans of orthodoxy were forced to temporize, even after their victory over Iconoclasm. The most orthodox of emperors, Constantine Porphyrogenitus, stultified the traditions of his party by boasting that he had renewed the celebration of the Brumalia with all the ancient pomp. The best that orthodoxy could do was to guide the church toward the absorption of all theatrical elements that were not positively obnoxious. In the hope of withdrawing Christians from the pagan stage, it had long before permitted a sort of ecclesiastical drama which presaged and resembled the earliest religious play in the West. This tendency existed even in the time of Augustine, who described certain litanies recited by Christians as similar to the performances of the pantomimes.[1] A bit of

[1] Pliny's famous letter to Trajan is proof of the theatrical character, speaking from the mediaeval Greek point of view, of the antiphonal singing of the early Christians. Augustine, sermon on St. Cyprian.

ecclesiastical drama not confined to one church nor to one country was the little Herod play[1] which, in at least one form, seems to date from Arian times. The earliest Herod plays show marked traces of classical knowledge by their quotations from Virgil, Sallust, Claudian, and other ancient poets. Possibly other episodes of the gospels were represented in brief dramatic interludes quite as early as that of Herod, though no trace of such has been recovered. That the idea involved in the dances of the Gnostics and the acted litanies of Christians was not left undeveloped may be inferred from the meager notices of the service instituted about the close of the sixth century by the emperor Maurice in the church of the Blachernae in honor of the Four Hundred Martyrs. One of the participants in this ceremony was dressed to represent Christ.

VIII

This slow process of putting the theater inside of the church by degrees was completed at a stroke by the Iconoclasts; for they simply transferred the dance and music of the stage to the churches with the dancers and musicians.[2] The proof that this

[1] Karl Pearson, *The Chances of Death*, Vol. II, p. 287.

[2] Sathas, *τοδ'* ff., *τπβ'*, *ιζ'*, *τπδ'*, n. 1, *τπγ'*, *νε'*. See Hone, *Ancient Mysteries*, on Theophylactus. As to the finances of the empire consult Neumann, *Die Weltstellung des byzantinischen Reiches*, pp. 24 ff., 58 f.

Descriptions of the Feast of Fools in the West are numerous. There is a brief one in Pearson's book as already cited, p. 282. On pp.

was an effective device lies in the fact that the orthodox party, though it had been subjected to unsparing satire, was obliged, on returning to power, to imitate its foes. It had learned that the obscure mime, to whom citizenship and the meanest of human rights were denied, was a dangerous adversary. In place of new proscriptions, it deemed best to make this enemy a friend. The council which proclaimed the victory of the church re-enacted only the canon against icons in the theaters, and this was aimed exclusively at the scene-painters. The *practica* of the Iconoclastic council were sung unchanged at Nicaea. The drama and its music were indeed put out of the churches, but only to be relegated to a theater under ecclesiastical patronage along with the comparatively new, already popular, but not yet Christianized, instrument, the organ. With these advantages and the

285 f. Professor Pearson translates the following passage from the now lost manuscript of Herrad of Landsperg: "The old Fathers of the church in order to strengthen the belief of the faithful and to attract the unbeliever by this manner of religious service, rightly instituted at the Feast of the Epiphany or the Octave religious performances of such a kind as the Star guiding the Magi to the new-born Christ, the cruelty of Herod, the dispatch of the soldiers, the lying-in of the Blessed Virgin, the angel warning the Magi not to return to Herod, and other events of the birth of Christ. But what nowadays happens in many churches? Not a customary ritual, not an act of reverence, but of irreligion and extravagance conducted with all the license of youth. The priests having changed their clothes go forth as a troop of warriors; there is no distinction between priest and warrior to be marked. At an unfitting gathering of priests and laymen, the church is desecrated by feasting and drinking, buffoonery, unbecoming jokes, play, the clang of weapons, the presence of shameless wenches, the vanities of the world and all sorts of disorder. Rarely does such a gathering break up without quarrelling."

indulgence of the civil authorities the ecclesiastical theater began to make a greal deal of noise in the world. The Council in Trullo had attempted to put a stop to the tumult in the churches which resulted from the practice of applauding or disapproving the preacher audibly; but without much success. With the final reconciliation between the clergy and the actors came worse noise and a new kind of spectacle which enabled the people to get their religion and their comedy on certain occasions, both in one spot and at the same hour. Even the Iconoclasts had not dreamed of what now took place. The solemn aisles of St. Sophia re-echoed to the songs, the dances, the shoutings, the declamation, the humor, grotesque or otherwise, of the Hippodrome. This innovation is ascribed to Theophylactus, patriarch of Constantinople, and it fixes a date in the history of the mediaeval theater for all Europe. Theophylactus has the honor, such as it is, of having originated what became in the West the Feast of Asses and the Feast of Fools. Sober-minded churchmen censured this travesty, rude and coarse beyond imagination, of sacred things; but it was supported by the monks, favored by the highest clergy, and tolerated by the emperor. Theophylactus is supposed to have been a son of the emperor Romanus I, but his power was due to the fact that he was not only patriarch of the Eastern Church, but

brother-in-law to the reigning emperor, Constantine VIII. His authority would hardly have availed for such a purpose, if the empire had been financially as sound as it was in the days of Justinian. Expansion under the Macedonian house to which Constantine belonged had been marvelous, but it was not accompanied by a proportionate increase of revenue. There was no longer a vast surplus to be wasted on the Hippodrome for the amusement of the capital. While the state, in comparison with the business which it had to manage, was poor, the church was rich. The necessity of amusing the populace of Constantinople was a presupposition of the Byzantine polity. The government was founded on this principle. So the church in its relations with the state was obliged, willingly or not, to share a burden which the civil power could no longer carry. But no other man could have ventured to undertake what Theophylactus performed—the introduction of the professional actors and dancers from the Hippodrome into St. Sophia. After him the custom continued unchanged for centuries, in spite of bitter censure on the part of stricter churchmen. It is important to remember that the date of this theatrical revolution in the Greek Church was about 990 A. D., and to note also the family connections of Theophylactus. But of these hereafter. Sixty years later Cedrenus, the historian, alluded to the

disorder caused by festive merrymakers in the great church, and at the end of the next two centuries Balsamon, patriarch of Antioch, complained of the gross abominations committed by the priests at Christmas and festivals, not only in St. Sophia, but in churches elsewhere, observing that on certain holidays the clergy presented a variety of feigned characters, and even entered the choir in a military habit. In fact, the custom of allowing the masquers from the theaters and the streets to invade the places of worship spread from St. Sophia to the great churches of the provincial cities. St. John, archbishop of Euchania or Theodoripolis, took a prominent part in theatrical performances before his own altar, and composed hymns that were close copies or imitations of pieces written by Euripides; while the patriarch Michael the Cerullarius from his pulpit directed a company of actors to perform a series of plays representing the life of Christ from his birth to his baptism. In these plays John the Baptist, instead of his usual title of Prodromus, bore that of Acersecomes—an appellation in pagan times deemed particularly appropriate to Dionysus.

Shortly after the time of Theophylactus the liturgical drama began to be known in western Europe. Little interludes illustrating those parts of the service known as the *Officium stellae*, the *Adoratio Christi*, the *Elevatio crucis*, and the

Visitatio sepulchri began to be popular in the eleventh century.[1] In the course of two or three generations these became so familiar that they were already looked on as ancient, and were supposed to have been devised by the ancient fathers of the church to strengthen the confidence of the faithful and to attract the unbeliever. The Feast of Asses, the Feast of Fools, the Boy Bishop, and other ecclesiastical relaxations were, in their proper form, as yet unknown. No burlesque church play, except a meager and very ancient one in which Herod was represented, can be traced in the West above the twelfth century. In general, western opinion on the subject of actors reflected that of the Christian East. Mimes and histriones must still have existed—the descendants probably of the scattered and persecuted denizens of the old Roman circus and amphitheater—for Charlemagne and his successors took cognizance of them in the laws. But the theater, still perfectly familiar to the East, was utterly unknown in Germany, France, and England, and very indistinctly remembered in Italy. North of the Alps, in fact, there was as yet no city life in the sense understood by Byzantines, Italians, and at the present day by all civilized peoples. The villagers, rustics, and burghers gathered in multitudes only at fairs, which increased in numbers rapidly from

[1] Pearson, *op. cit.*, pp. 289 ff.

early Merovingian times onward. Merchants came to these fairs from near and far; they followed their trade from one market to another,[1] and, in order to make sure of business, kept in their company jugglers, buffoons, and minstrels to please the people. In those days and long afterward the popular poet of the kind to whom we owe Goliards and Latin student poems and the earliest vernacular verse were vagabonds. Then, too, a large proportion of the serious and devout people of the world were wanderers, either going to or coming from the holy places of Palestine, the shrines of St. James of Compostella, St. Baume of Provence, St. Reine, Mount St. Michael, and elsewhere. These pilgrims also had their tales and poems. Taking all these classes of vagrants together, we may say that there was no class of the sedentary population which they did not reach. Their influence was mostly foreign; for, if they were not strangers, their stories and ballads and acted scenes were often the original product of distant lands. Through them came the impulse which changed the character of the festal services in the churches; in them and in their audiences can be seen the beginning of that education for actors and for the people at large which after some centuries made legitimate drama possible. When the minstrels built a church in Paris, we find that they

[1] Hazlitt, *Warton's History of English Poetry*, Vol. III, p. 293.

chose as patrons two Greek saints,[1] one of whom had been an actor. Within a hundred years after the first suggestion of interludes in the ritual a fairly complex ecclesiastical play was developed in France; a little later in England, by French clerks; and somewhat later still in Germany. In the next generation it took thirty characters to play a certain mystery of the nativity.[2] Thenceforward the chain of succession is unbroken to the latest passion-play.

It is clear that Voltaire and those who followed him were right in deriving the ritual play and mystery from Constantinople. Where they were wrong was in the supposition that Italy was intermediary in the transaction. It was easy to show that even in England the play of St. Catherine, and in France other more important works, long preceded anything of the kind known to Italy. In fact, the ritual drama was reluctantly cultivated south of the Alps even after it had become popular in the rest of Europe. The literature of the tenth and eleventh centuries in Italy, meager as it is, amply proves that nothing could succeed there which was devoid of Latin classical reminiscence. When the so-called "miracle" and "mystery" came into being at the West, it was as part of the services of the church. The Italians knew well that

[1] Matthew, *Popular History of Music*. The names of the saints were Julian and Genesius.

[2] Pearson, *op. cit.*, p. 303.

these ecclesiastical dramas were not an evolution of the ritual. The Byzantines also knew this. But, while the Italians looked askance at the newcomer, more than suspicious of its origin, while the northern nations admired it as the proper offspring of the church, the Byzantines were perfectly aware that the church had been forced by the struggles of a thousand years to adopt the last descendant of its hated and now decrepit enemy. The drama of the West was beginning precisely where that of the East was coming to an end. When the Crusaders reached Constantinople, they could see the part which the players and singers from the Hippodrome took in the liturgy of St. Sophia. It was only a short time before the first invasion of the East by the Latins that the church writers, Balsamon and Scylitses inveighed against the orgies due to the former patriarch, Theophylactus. The chronicles show that the warriors from the West were impressed by the public shows and masquerades, and it is a suggestive fact that the first mysteries of western Europe were subsequent to the first crusade.

To this point of contact, the approach, so far as the East was concerned, had been by a long process of restriction.[1] The tendency in Constantinople for ages had been toward a condition of affairs wherein everything to the minutest detail

[1] Neumann, as above cited, pp. 11 ff.

could be regulated automatically; where neither general nor statesman nor ecclesiastic nor actor nor playwright could be confronted by a situation that had not been provided for beforehand. The whole intent of the state, social, political, religious, literary, became preservative, not inventive. In this fact must be sought the reason for the immense compilatory activity which is associated with the names of Basil and Leo, and particularly of Constantine Porphyrogenitus. The effort was to reduce every kind of knowledge to writing, so that a precedent might be found for everything that could happen. In this atmosphere of conservatism, thick with the dust of schools and libraries and museums, it was of no use to look for men of genius in letters. The Byzantine system needed no men of genius, it needed only men capable of prolonging its civilization. It was no mere misfortune that under such conditions no Sophocles nor Menander arose to fill the declining stage with dramatic poems of high merit. This was the inevitable curse of a society which, mobile as it was within certain limits, was absolutely proof against all ideas that were really revolutionary. Short of genius, it easily held its own with the fresher nations of the West. A Byzantine traveler in the closing ages of the empire found nothing better than he had at home. The best religious drama of the West was inferior in literary structure, in

action, in accessories, to the drama familiar to him. In addition, he possessed and he prized the treasures bequeathed to him by antiquity. The Byzantines were precisely in the position of the modern world since the times of Shakespeare and Molière; with this difference, that for centuries on centuries they flocked to the performances of the great plays of Athens, while the modern world sees Shakespeare, less than three hundred years after his death, with difficulty. In those times as now, a few men in love with art, not as artists, but as students, preserved the clear traditions of a glorious past. Meanwhile pilgrims and crusaders and wandering peddlers carried to the West, not a notion of the drama, but a notion of religious plays and spectacles such as they were capable of imitating. The conclusion of the whole matter is that whatever value the stage tradition had, which was handed down by the performers of the religious plays to the generation which represented and enjoyed the dramas of Shakespeare, was ultimately due wholly to the uninterrupted culture of Byzantium.

LIBRARY OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

TRADITIONS OF DRAMATIC IMPULSES IN RELIGION

CHAPTER II

TRADITIONS OF DRAMATIC IMPULSES IN RELIGION

I

What may be called conscious effort to produce a body of Christian belles-lettres began with Apollinarius, father and son of the same name, of whom the former remained a presbyter all his life, while the latter became a bishop.[1] Both were trained sophists and grammarians. They were not among the fanatics of that age, though they suffered by them and with them, who irritated the emperor Julian by proclaiming that Christians had no need to read the works of the ancient pagans. Julian's answer is well known. He forbade Christians to read what their self-appointed spokesmen said was superfluous, and to make sure that his decree should be of due effect, he excluded Chris-

[1] Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, Vol. VII, p. 691. Sathas, *σξγ'*, ff., *ηε'* ff., *ηβ'*, *ηε'* f.: 'Ηνίκα δὴ 'Απολλινάριος οὗτος εἰς καιρὸν τῇ πολυμαθείᾳ καὶ τῇ φύσει χρησάμενος . . . . ἐπραγματεύσατο δὲ καὶ τοῖς Μενάνδρου δράμασιν εἰκασμένας κωμῳδίας· καὶ τὴν Εὐριπίδου τραγῳδίαν . . . . ἐμιμήσατο. Sozomen, V. 8. Περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐμμέτρων ὧν ἐμνήσθην καὶ πρῴην, διττὸς αὐτῷ γέγονεν ὁ σκοπός· πρῶτος μὲν ὅπως τὴν ἄθεσμον 'Ιουλιανοῦ τοῦ τυράννου νομοθεσίαν μειρακιώδη καὶ ἀνίσχυρον ἀπελέγξῃ, κελεύουσαν μὴ μετεῖναι χριστιανοῖς τῆς 'Ελλήνων παιδείας· δεύτερον δέ, ἐπεὶ ἐώρα 'Απολλινάριον ῥάψαντα πολυστίχους βίβλους ἐκ διαφόρων μέτρων, καὶ τούτοις κλέψαντα τοὺς πολλοὺς εἰς τὴν αἵρεσιν ὡς ἐλλόγιζον δῆθεν, ἀναγκαῖον ᾠήθη ἐν 'Αριαζοῖς ἡσυχάζων . . . . τηνικαῦτα γράψαι τὰ ἔμμετρα. St. Gregorii Nazianzeni opera, Benedictine edition, p. clviii.

tians from the schools. To evade this sweeping condemnation to illiteracy the Apollinarii conceived and executed a plan by which the material of Scripture was remolded into forms which illustrated the whole varied art of Greek composition. Among the rest they wrote tragedies as near like those of Euripides as they could make them, and comedies after the style of Menander. Subsequently they and their works were condemned for heresy, and by one author they were called Arians simply because they wrote dramas, and thus, as he said, introduced the theater into the church. Of course, all their writings were diligently sought and carefully destroyed when found. It must be noted, however, that similar works by more orthodox writers were no better preserved than those of the so-called heretics. The attempts of Methodius the martyr, of Gregory of Nazianzen, and of John of Damascus to imitate the great works of the Greek theater with plays formed on the antique model out of material drawn from the Scriptures showed that the Christian talent was fitter for other things than for the drama. Christians themselves must have been conscious of the defect, otherwise the silence of the scholiasts would have been less persistent with respect to these biblical plays. Of the whole body of this Christian dramatic literature only one piece, Ὁ Χριστὸς Πάσχων, has survived complete to the present day. This is

possibly a work of Apollinarius, and it probably escaped the fate of the rest because there was a mystery about its authorship. It was long attributed to Gregory Nazianzen and was included among his published works. It shows how simple the process was of turning the classic tragedy to a Christian purpose. The great tragic writers of antiquity betrayed little skill in the differentiation of character. Much less could this be expected of imitators who evidently worked in haste, with the skill of high culture, but with the restricted aim of minutely copying chosen models. It is an open question with pious minds whether the one drama which has been preserved would not have been well lost with the rest; for while it is esteemed psychologically as a parody—or more accurately, a cento—of Aeschylus, Euripides, Lycophron, and others, still it has the defect, from the religious point of view, of representing the Virgin more like Hecuba mourning for her children than like the mother of Jesus lamenting, not without hope, at the foot of the cross. The author of this play asserted that the Virgin had never before his time been represented on the stage. Hence the work may be taken as the starting-point of the mediaeval and modern passion-play. Its free treatment of the gospel narrative, and its lack of merely traditional and legendary elements, are marks of the age to which it belongs. A signifi-

cant fact is that the *Marienklage* so characteristic of the German passion-play[1] is a prominent feature of this Greek tragedy, and this leads our critic to remark that the relation between the Greek and the German is not accidental. He finds the Greek tragic spirit in the rude German spectacle, and adds:

There is scarcely a single greater passion-play in which the beauty of the *Marienklage*—the grief of the Virgin at the cross and the tomb of her Son—does not fill the reader with a deep sympathy, and render him conscious of the truly pathetic, nay, dramatic, feeling struggling with a primitive mode of expression and often a pitiable versification.

[1] Pearson, *Chances of Death and Other Studies*, Vol. II, p. 272: "There is something almost of the Greek tragic spirit in the Marienklage, and this relation to the Greek is not so accidental as might be supposed. The earliest Marienklage which I have come across actually exists in a fourth-century Greek passion-play, Χριστὸς Πάσχων."

Professor Pearson had perhaps read all German plays of this sort that are accessible, and it is just his apparent lack of a critical knowledge of *Christus patiens* as related to its sources which makes his testimony significant. He does not read into every line the context of the place from which it was borrowed, as the painstaking critics do who dispute so earnestly over the authorship and date of the piece. Thus he gets out of it sense which seems impossible to Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur*, p. 357: "Ungebildeten blieb das Stück wegen seiner altertümlichen Sprache überhaupt unzugänglich; auf den Gebildeten aber musste es ähnlich wirken wie jene musikalischen Potpourris, in welchem Fragmente verschiedener Texte und Melodien ohne Vermittelung aneinander gereiht sind. Mit dem bekannten Εἰθ' ὤφελ' tritt die Gottesmutter als Maria Medea auf die Bühne; in schnellster Folge wechselt sie ihr Kostüm, sie wird zur Hekabe, Kassandra, Klytämnestra, Andromache, sogar zum Hermes; dieselbe Chamäleonnatur haben all andern Personen. Selbst die in der lebendigen Sprache längst verschallenen Exklamationen ὀτοτοτοί, ἰώ μοι, ἰώ erzeugen hier eine komische Wirkung." Krumbacher, and most of the later authorities whom he cites, agree, largely upon the ground of certain peculiarities of language and style in those parts of the drama supposed to be original, that it cannot be a work of the fourth

Not deterred by the fate of the Apollinarii, other men of Greek culture, especially monks in their cells, continued to read the old Hellenic poets and to imitate them by adapting to their ancient prosody paraphrases from the Scriptures. Synesius, bishop of Ptolemais, in particular, composed both tragedies and comedies on lines originally traced by Crates, Diphilus, and Philemon. The loss of the dramas of Synesius is more to be regretted than the destruction of the works of the

century, but must be relegated to the twelfth or at best to the eleventh. But they cannot agree as to authorship. One is ready to attribute it to Tzetzes, another to Ptochoprodromus, another to Phyle, while Krumbacher himself apparently favors Theodore Prodromus, to whom it is also attributed by Brambs in his little edition of the play for the Teubner classics. But it may be said of all these critics that they are prejudiced against the possibility of giving the work an early date, for the reason that it affects the study of the religious drama in the West precisely as Pearson indicates. They show no motive for the work in the eleventh, twelfth, or thirteenth century, and it is difficult to see how there could be one unless early work of the kind acknowledged by Apollinarius of Laodicea and Gregory Nazianzen remained in existence. The most elaborate cento known to the present writer—it is under his hand at this moment—is *Virgilii Evangelisantis Christiados*, in thirteen books, by Alexander Ross, a Scottish hanger-on of the Court of James I. But it is impossible to imagine that Ross would ever have constructed it, if he had not known the examples left from early Christian times by Eudocia, Proba, Sedulius, and others. Similarly the hypothesis of the late origin of *Christus patiens* necessarily presupposes antique models and not merely acquaintance with the classic dramas of Athens. On the other hand, may not the peculiarities of the text as now known be accounted for by supposing that it was an acting play till a late period and so suffered some changes? The violation of the unities would not necessarily have prevented its being presented in the usual Byzantine manner, either by a group of tragedians or by recitation with mimetic accompaniment. Even if the technique is bad, as Krumbacher says, it is certainly not impossible. Frequent and abrupt changes of place have not in all ages been fatal to a theatrical piece any more than the pretense of crowding the events of a lifetime into a few hours.

Apollinarii, since he was not merely a great Hellenic scholar, but a man born to the Greek language, and minutely and sympathetically observant of life. As the hymns which he wrote that have survived are the best memorial of the Christian lyric poetry of his time, so we may suppose that his dramas would have shown the nascent Christian theater at its best, and would have also given a clearer idea than we now possess of the merits of the latest comic writers of the Greek stage. Another Christian writer of tragedy at this time may have been that persecuted opponent of Mariolatry, Nestorius. According to a dubious entry in a Chaldaean catalogue copied by Fabricius,[1] the title *Liber tragoediae* occurs with those of other books which must have been written by Nestorius after his exile. The inference is that it was written, like the rest, for his Asiatic adherents. Probably it was only in the title chosen that this work betrayed any dramatic quality, for it was certainly autobiographic in its material. But even in that case it shows how deeply the language of the stage had penetrated the life and thought least friendly to it.

If it was thus with enemies, what must have been the hold of the theater on the world in general? The answer to this question may be guessed

[1] Neander, *History of the Christian Religion and Church*, Torrey's translation, Vol. II, p. 494, n. 3, where another "tragedy" written by one Irenaeus is mentioned.

from the conduct of the emperors in times when the balance still wavered between Christianity and paganism. Julian, as already noted, though he despised the theater, felt obliged to have actors in his retinue for the entertainment of his officers and soldiers. The emperors Arcadius and Honorius, reforming an abuse of what would now be called an advertising privilege, decreed that no statues or images (posters or wall pictures) of actors should be placed in the public arcades or anywhere in the neighborhood of the portraits of the emperors, but conceded to them every right in the entrances and proscenia of the theaters. These emperors doubtless exceeded good taste when they described the actors as *viles histriones*, but the statues and pictures were mere advertisements. The church historian Theodoretus writes that tragedians were depicted by the artists in the character or the attitude that had given them popularity, and he specifies the Creon and Antigone of Sophocles, and the Oenomaeus, a title used by both Sophocles and Euripides, showing that the earliest Greek drama still remained in favor after the lapse of almost a thousand years. It was made an occasion for railing against the emperor Theodosius that he willingly supported actors and dancers, and that to provide funds for public amusements he crippled Stilicho's campaign among the Goths. But he and other emperors well knew how impoli-

tic it would be to yield to the more fanatical churchmen. They were aware that in a Greek or Hellenistic city the cessation of the theaters would be understood to mean great grief or great peril. This was so obvious that Libanius, when Julian deserted Antioch in anger, advised the citizens to close the theaters by way of showing how extreme their anxiety was at the loss of the imperial patronage. As Antioch was a city of theaters in one or another of which every kind of spectacle, from the legitimate drama down to dog-fights and prestidigitation, was to be seen, the suggestion of Libanius emphasizes the value of the emperor's presence to the business of the city. The classic drama was well cultivated in Antioch. Libanius enumerated among the ancient plays which were reproduced, the *Pasiphaë*, either the tragedy of Euripides or one by Alcaeus with the same title; the *Acharnians* of Aristophanes; Menander's comedy, the *Tictousae;* and many others. There appear to have been plays also by contemporary writers, and it is certain that there were many pieces corresponding to modern ballets and pantomimes. Libanius named many such spectacles in his speech defending the professional dancers.

II

From the beginning of Greek Christianity, all the heretical sects, owing to the animosity of the

church toward the theater, took pains to cultivate the popular affection for the stage, even introducing the dance into their religious services.[1] Especially was this true of the Gnostics and the Gnostic hymn-writers, Basilides and Valentine. The adversary of these men, the orthodox Methodius, found it necessary to follow their example. He added a new species to the imitative Christian literature by writing dialogues modeled upon those of Plato. One of these, entitled Περὶ Αὐτεξουσίου, is particularly distinguished by having a prologue which, in the fashion of those spoken by the mimes in the theater, set forth the argument of the piece that followed. His composition, he explained, was not to be sung by the death-dealing sirens of the Greeks, but by a divine chorus of prophets. Nevertheless, he frequently cited lines from Homer and betrayed acquaintance with themes of ancient tragedy. Another of his dialogues, the *The Symposium of the Ten Virgins*, is interesting because it seems to forecast the morality of the mediaeval stage. Ten virgins—Marcella, Theophila, Thalia, Theopatra, Thallousa, Agathe, Procilla, Thecla, Thysiana, and Domnina—are invited to a banquet in the beautiful garden of Arete, daughter of Philosophia. Two other Virgins, Euboulion and Gregorion, are introduced in the prologue. In the course of the dialogue, a

[1] Sathas, ρλβ' ff.

hymn, imitated from the *Parthenia* of Alcman and Pindar, is sung by Thecla, her companions singing the epode in the manner of a chorus. The poem is an alphabetical acrostic, and is thus connected with a theatrical amusement which was for a long time very popular with the Byzantines.

This poetical device, the alphabetary or abecedary, merits more than a passing notice, since it displays the influence of Byzantine literary fashions on the rest of the world. The name "alphabetaria" was given by the Byzantines to poems which were composed in the form of an acrostic upon the letters of the alphabet in their order. The device was ancient and not peculiarly Hellenic, as is shown in the twenty-fifth, thirty-fourth, thirty-seventh, and with special care and perfection in the one hundred and nineteenth psalms. Extant mediaeval Greek literature presents many specimens. Sufficient knowledge of these can be gained from the printed collections of miscellaneous writings, for example, Boissonade's *Anecdota Graeca e codicibus regiis*,[1] in which the first

[1] Manitius, *Geschichte des christlich-lateinischen Poesie*, p. 21: "Wir können hier noch einer Eigentümlichkeit der christlichen Poesie gedenken, nämlich der akrostischen Anlage. Eine Abart derselben fanden wir schon bei Commodian und bei Augustin, in dessen Hymnus die einzelnen Strophen mit den aufeinanderfolgenden Buchstaben des Alphabets anfangen. Solche Abecedarien sind in der späteren Zeit nicht selten. Dichter wie Sedulius und Fortunatus haben sich gleichfalls dieser Spielerei bedient. Auch des eigentlichen Akrostichon haben wir bei Commodian gedacht. Diese poetische Form tritt sonst nur vereinzelt auf; sie zeigt sich allerdings schon in der älteren römischen Litteratur, hat aber in der lateinischen Poesie nie recht heimisch

example of the kind (Vol. I, p. 153), entitled "Advice of Menander," is made up of lines taken from the works of that poet and arranged alphabetically. The number of lines to each letter varies, and Boissonade omitted part of the manuscript. Of another cento made in the same way from Menander he gives merely a few lines. Three original poems (that is, not centos), in which one verse is given to each letter, come next. They are by an author whom Boissonade thinks to be Leo Barda. Then (Vol. IV, p. 386), occurs what is literally a lexicon in verse of nearly a thousand lines, in which the sections devoted to the different letters are separated from one another by single verses which interrupt the alphabetic series. Occasional irregular lines occur also within the sections. Another acrostic, one verse to each letter (Vol. IV, p. 436), is credited to a certain Ignatius. Two similar poems follow—one by Nilus, the other by Theodorus Prodromus; and after these comes a really fine poem arranged alphabetically by distichs, the hymn of a troubled soul to the Savior. Alluding to the work of Ignatius, Boissonade cites a similar poem in a Bodleian

werden wollen. Nur ganz zerstreut findet sie sich auch bei den christlichen Dichtern. Commodians *Instructiones* sind das einzige Beispiel für die Dürchführung des Akrostichon. Es scheint, dass der Dichter mnemotechnische Zwecke damit verbunden hat, andre Gründe sind eigentlich nicht leicht einzusehen." See also pp. 31, 317, 342, 379, 428, 450, 488–90, 506 f., 508. Of course, the matter is not of importance. It is merely another evidence of the parallel and mutual literary activity of Byzantium and the West throughout the Dark Ages.

codex, also hymns in this style to Bacchus and Apollo from the *Anthology*, a hymn to the Virgin by Joannes Geometra, an anonymous hymn to the Trinity and others including one specimen in French.

The fashion affected the Western church, as is shown by the hymn "Ad coeli clara," incorrectly attributed to Hilary of Poitiers.[1] In fact, the abecedary in Latin ran a course parallel to that of the alphabetary in Greek. Probably the trick was known to both languages in classic times, but was not much used until church writers took it up, apparently as they did accented verse and rhyme, in deference to the taste and mnemonic convenience of their hearers and readers. It was particularly useful to a man like the first Christian Latin poet, Commodian, whose verse was merely the vehicle for useful but prosaic instruction and argument. An early Christian abecedary is attributed to Secundinus, nephew of St. Patrick, the missionary to Ireland. Its ninety-two lines are arranged in twenty-three stanzas, each beginning with the corresponding letter of the alphabet. After these in point of time comes the hymn "A solis ortus cardine ad usque" of Coelius Sedulius. Augustine, besides quoting the Sibylline

[1] See Duffield or Marsh on the Latin hymns. The Earl of Selborne's fine essay on the whole subject in the *Encyclopaedia Brittanica* cannot be consulted in the cheap American editions of that work. It has been cut to pieces by some literary blacksmith.

acrostic on the name of the Savior, also composed an abecedary, using the letters from *A* to *V* of the Latin alphabet. Isidore of Seville attempted something like the more elaborate ἀλφαβεταρία of the Greeks in a poem sixty lines of which began with *A*, seven with *B* and *N* respectively, three with *M*, two with each of the remaining letters down to *S*, and one with each letter respectively from *S* to *Z*. Two hymns of the kind are noted among the contents of a curious relic of the ancient British church called the "Antiphonary of Bangor." The Venerable Bede inserted in his history an abecedary of his own composition, an elegy on Queen Aedelthryd. It would be easy to add a great number of pieces to the few which have been mentioned. A fact almost as curious as the fancy for this metrical catena was that Aldhelm, who delighted in puzzles and eccentricities of prosody, neglected the acrostic ABC. His enigma or riddle,[1] however, on the letters, gives some light on the disposition of mind in which they could be viewed with reverence:

Nos denae et septem genitae sine voce sorores;
Sex alias nothas non dicimus annumerandas:
Nascimur ex ferro, rursus ferro moribundae,
Necnon et volucris penna volitantis ad aethram:
Terni nos fratres incerta matre creant.
Sui cupit instanter sitiens audiere docentes,
Tum cito prompta damus rogitanti verba silenter.

[1] Sancti Aldhelmi *Opera quae extant*, Ed. Giles, p. 257.

There is a kind of acrostic which has been more or less prevalent ever since it was invented down to the present—the one in which the initial letters spell a name. These also have had their most elaborate cultivation among the Greek Christians. The vast hymnology of the Greek church is practically indexed by the initial letters of the stanzas instead of by first lines. To the Greeks also was due the invention of the telesticha, in which the final letters of each verse were arranged like the initials in an acrostic. In fact, the variants on the original device have been well-nigh innumerable.

III

Of the practical aid rendered to the Hellenic stage by the empress Eudocia something has already been said. As an Athenian woman she had been trained to love the theater and the drama.[1] Her conversion to Christianity did not efface this preference of her girlhood. We owe to her primarily the knowledge that in her time Athens was still the home of polite comedy. The traditions of this Athenian comedy must have been very recent, indeed, if the dramatist Dexippus mentioned by Eudocia and afterward by Suidas was identical with the historian of that name who flourished about the end of the fourth century and renewed

[1] Sathas, σο′ ff., ρκδ′ ff., ροϑ′, τιγ′, τκη′, τκϑ′, τα′, τλβ′ ff.

the ancient type of Athenian by adding to his literary renown praiseworthy achievement as a strategus in defending his city from the Goths. The titles have been preserved of five comedies by Dexippus. It is probable from other evidence that the Athenians retained at this time, and even preserved until the reign of Justinian, their ancient predilection for the play. While the other cities of the empire cared most for the Hippodrome, Athens preferred the genuine drama, especially comedy. According to St. Gregory, the matriculation of students at the many philosophical schools of the city was elaborated in a comic performance, partly improvised no doubt, but for the largest part traditional. A theatrical ceremony also took place at the enthroning of a new dean over the body of public teachers, as illustrated in the case of Leontius, whose daughter Athenais became the empress Eudocia. In all probability these performances of the Athenian sophists were imitated in other cities, particularly in the schools of law. Until the Council in Trullo forbade the practice, the law students of Byzantium were accustomed to form theatric corps distinguished by the stoles which they wore, and to play κυλίστρας, theatric games, similar to those of Athens just mentioned. Thus the dramas and ceremonies in the early universities and schools of the West were neither unique nor original in the history of stu-

dent life.[1] The customs of the Athenians were familiarized to the rest of the empire, if they were not well known before, by the policy of Constantine, who commanded the sophists of Athens and Thebes to resort to Constantinople every year for a public contest with their rivals in that city. These contests were not scientific or philosophical meetings, but public exhibitions of the kind first promoted by Ptolemy Philadelphus. The custom survived until Justinian closed the Athenian schools and banished the last of the pagan sages to Persia. Even then Byzantium did not allow the tradition to lapse altogether. There were apparently prizes to be won by contests among the literati of the capital, though other cities were no longer represented. Theodore Hyrtacenus pronounced an encomium upon the Virgin which seems to have been a prize oration in what he called *τὸν ἱερὸν ἀγῶνα.* The emperor Andronicus was a fanatical worshiper of Mary; his edict on the Feast of the Assumption is described by Boissonade[2] as more worthy of a monk than of a monarch. He is plausibly supposed to have offered prizes for such compositions as that of Hyrtacenus; but, with or without the contest, the sophist exhibitions were continued in great pomp to which a theatric

[1] Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, Vol. II, p. 675.

[2] Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, III, 1; II, 107, n. 1: "Nova illa Andronici lex, monacho quam imperatore dignior."

effect was given by the choruses which chanted parts of a poem, the other parts being read by the author or by some one in his place. Paul the Silentiary, who flourished under Justinian, pronounced two such ἐκφράσεις, as they were called, in honor of the foundation of the church of St. Sophia. On these occasions the poet, accompanied by the guilds, went in procession to the palace and in the presence of the emperor recited the first part of his poem. Then the procession went to church, where Paul declaimed his remaining verses. He described his performance by the word θέατρον, and in addition to the guilds probably had the aid also of church singers and of musicians from the Hippodrome.

This half-literary, half-scenic entertainment may help to explain the use of a poem, fragments of which have been preserved, written by Eudocia, the empress, on the legend of St. Cyprian. This legend was one of the highly dramatic themes in the traditions of the early church, the other being the story of Thecla versified by Eudocia's contemporary, Basil, bishop of Seleucia. Two persons so much in the public eye of their time, and so well able to control the methods of publication then in use, are not likely to have written these elaborate poems for their own improvement merely, or for private reading. The likelihood is that the pieces were intended for recitation in churches by

choruses, with the representation of individual characters wherever these occurred. The dramatic quality of the legend of St. Cyprian can be inferred from Calderon's treatment of it in his *Magico prodigioso*,[1] and its possibilities in recitation from Southey's ballad[2] on the similar legend of St. Basil. The way in which such poetry could be made a part of the religious service is indicated in Mr. Price's remarks[3] on a custom of the ancient church of France:

It was enjoined by the ritual of the Gallican church that the lives of the saints should be read during mass on the days consecrated to their memory. On the introduction of the Roman liturgy which forbade the admixture of any extraneous matter with the service of the mass, this practice appears to have been suspended, and the lives of the Saints were read only at evening prayer. But even in this the inveteracy of custom seems speedily to have established its rights; and there is reason to believe that the lives of such as are mentioned in the New Testament were regularly delivered from the chancel. Of this a curious example, the *Planch de St. Esteve*, has been published by M. Raynouard, where the passages from the Acts of the Apostles referring to St. Stephen are introduced between the metrical translations of them. From France it is probable this rite found its way into England.

[1] Creizenach, *Versuch einer Geschichte des Volksschauspiels vom Doctor Faust*, p. 37.

[2] Southey, *Complete Poetical Works* (American edition), pp. 533-53.

[3] Warton, *History of English Poetry* (Hazlitt's edition), Vol. II, p. 63, n. 1.

Warton notes the existence in the British Museum of a manuscript of legendary tales in rhyme and in the northern dialect to be read to the people by the priests on Sundays and holidays. The custom dates in English parish churches from the first half of the thirteenth century, but seems to have been observed still earlier in the monastic congregations.

That the poems of Eudocia and Basil, and other writers of their time who performed similar tasks —for example, Cyril and Nonnus—either made or marked an epoch in the reconciliation between Greek poetry and the church is indicated by the fact that now hymns became general in the churches and a Christian drama began to be popular. But this friendly disposition toward the drama, fostered by Eudocia and her husband, Theodosius the Younger, disappeared amid the persecutions under Leo I and his successor Zeno. These barbarians, though they banished actors, could not efface their influence. The most characteristic external mark of the actors was the careful preservation of their hair in honor of their patron, the unshorn or *abrocomus* Dionysus. As thus distinguished, they were often called *eumalloe;* or, with reference to the color of their hair, *caramalloe* or *chrysomalloe.* In this fashion they were imitated by painters and other artists attached to the stage, and even by the factions of the Hippodrome. Of course, these long-haired factions had

their place in the church, whatever became of the proscribed actors; and so from all sides ecclesiastics witnessed the gradual inflow of Dionysiac and theatric traditions into the congregations, bacchizing the monks and the prelates. The church bitterly revenged itself by its support of the tyrannical Zeno. Most of the men capable of writing history were killed under this emperor, but two who survived him, Evagrius and Theodore Anagnostes, gave a gloomy account of his character. The populace in the Hippodrome, when they cried out to his widow, "O Ariadne! give an orthodox emperor to rule the world; give a prosperous Easter to the world; give order and safety to the cities; banish that robber of the city called the prefect," were less anxious at heart about the first clause of their quadripartite tradition than about the other three. When her choice lighted on Anastasius, he was hailed with enthusiasm as the bringer of peace to the distracted state. Yet, as has already been pointed out, he was far from orthodoxy. Probably he went farther than mere heresy; for where he was anathematized by the church, there he was praised by the Neoplatonists, who described him as a genuine Hellene, a new Agesilaus, a lineal descendant of Zeus and Heracles. The philosophers would hardly have dared to speak of him thus, if they had not known that he himself took pride in his reputed descent. At

the moment there must have been great popularity in this. The Isaurian hordes that followed Leo and Zeno were a menace to the capital, and the anti-foreign feeling ran high.

A distinctive feature of the reign of Anastasius, as compared with that of his immediate predecessors, was the encouragement which he gave to the dramatic profession. In his time the centralizing tendency which led all men of talent to Constantinople had become irresistible. The great cities which gave a tone to civilization rarely produced great personalities; but they used many, and therefore drew to themselves all the talent of the provinces. The Constantinople of Justinian would have been a desert, so far as intellect was concerned, had it not been for the men who came from far and near—men who had ideas; and the same could have been said of the city in the time of Anastasius. With actors he himself intervened to bring about this result. Players and dramatic writers who had gained applause in provincial cities were invited to the capital, and honored and rewarded for performances before him. In these favors, however, the ostensible religious drama had no share. The Alexandrian Dorotheus who ventured to present a work of that kind on the stage was exiled to Africa. It must be added, however, that Dorotheus gave his play a political as well as a religious significance. Anastasius

viewed the theater as a school of ethics and gave practical encouragement to dramatists who used their art on the side of justice. An instance is on record. From the time of Constantine a heavy poll-tax, known as the *chrysargyrion*, had been levied which pressed heavily on the artisans, farmers, hetaerae, and beggars. As the collectors were authorized by the law to enforce payment even by torture, the tragic possibilities of the impost were unlimited. Timotheus of Gaza, a playwright and actor who had migrated to Constantinople, wrote a tragedy on the theme and had it performed in the presence of the emperor. He may himself have acted one of the parts. Of this we know nothing; we know not even what the Greeks would call the hypothesis of the drama. But it had an immediate and powerful effect. Anastasius, astounded at the disclosure of cruelties that were perpetrated under cover of law, abolished the tax forthwith. The joy of the people at their release from a burden which had been borne for centuries was echoed by the historians. It was said that only the pen of Thucydides could do justice to the subject, and that Anastasius had rivaled the exploits of his ancestor Heracles in destroying the Lernaean hydra. In Syria the gratitude of the people was expressed by a week of church-going and torchlight processions, and by the decision to hold a yearly festival in mem-

ory of an event so auspicious. This was a true labor festival. "All the artisans rejoiced," writes the historian sententiously. It is a pity that a play which produced so fine an effect was so easily lost and forgotten. Had it been preserved, it would have illustrated the methods of those schools of akroasis, rhetoric, acting, and dramatizing for which Syria was still famous.

IV

The disposition to utilize the manners and conditions of the times in dramatic writing seems to have been general. Thus a writer of the period who is known by his personal and place names combined, Aeneas Gazaeus, disclosed an abuse not unknown to the modern stage—by condemning the comedy which violated the privacies of life. This remark, or the feeling natural among sober-minded people which it expressed, seems to have been the occasion of a curious apology for the mimes in the form of an oratorical exercise by Choricius, the successor of Procopius on the sophist throne of Gaza. Choricius seems to have enjoyed special privileges in the theaters of Gaza, and his work is the only known source from which anything like a satisfactory account can be obtained of the Hellenic stage at the beginning of the sixth century.[1] His discourse is an evident imitation of

[1] Sathas, τλθ' ff., τλζ', ιδ', ρια', τνδ', τξθ'.

Libanius' reply in behalf of the professional dancers to the censures of Laelius Aristides. The complaints against the mimes which Choricius repelled were in general such as had been reiterated from the time of Demosthenes, namely, that they were teachers of immorality and licentiousness. The quarrel was not between the church and the theater, but between the actors of tragedy and the actors of comedy; and Choricius, defending the latter, insisted that their profession was no less noble nor less moral than that of the tragedians. This statement shows that the mime of Choricius was a different person from the buffoon whom Demosthenes censured, and from the mime familiar to the Romans. In fact, the mimes of Choricius seem to have been engaged chiefly in reviving the Attic Middle Comedy. If they performed works by contemporary authors, the defect noticed by Aeneas Gazaeus is as likely to have been in the playwright as in the players. The object of Aeneas was plain enough; he wished to restrict the theater to tragedy, because the ancient tragedies, particularly those of Euripides, still retained great popularity. He was just as severe on bad imitations of Euripides as he was on the domestic comedy. As long as the tragedians had no competition, they could make a living out of Euripides and still maintain the dignity of the legitimate stage. But now the mimes, taking to heart such

criticism as that of Aeneas Gazaeus, casting aside as far as possible works of the kind to which they had been addicted, began to revive productions of the classic period. The tragedians, instead of praising their professional cousins for this real effort to elevate the comic stage, were disgusted to see the honors and profits of the legitimate drama divided. Such appears to have been the controversy in which Choricius interfered. He explained that a mime, to be good, must have a fine voice, a ready enunciation, complete knowledge of the choric art and that of gesticulation, and must be natural in all that he was required to do. Choricius seems to have conceded the necessary inferiority of the comic to the tragic art as art. But he defended the artists; and they certainly deserved an advocate capable of appreciating their high aims, if, as he said, they presented the plays of Philemon and Menander, and occasionally those of Aristophanes. More rarely they acted little dramas rewritten from the material of the Homeric poems. Of the contemporary pieces which they played Choricius did not condemn all; those in which social or political wrongs were exposed, he thought, had a good effect in deterring men in power from doing evil.

It is noteworthy to find an author, at a time when the secular drama is supposed hardly to have begun in the West, who writes about dramatic sat-

ire almost in the manner of Choricius. We may infer from a passage in Levinus Lemnius' treatise on how to make the best of life,[1] that the Low Countries early in the sixteenth century had a theater mature enough to boast its traditions, which ridiculed the foibles of individuals and castigated social follies with success. The author was a physician, and his book *De miraculis occultis* was much read at one time. His essay, referred to above, appears to have been written before the year 1564. Counting the time that must have elapsed in the preparation of the work, which is one of experi-

[1] *De miraculis occultis naturae*, libri IIII.; *item de vita cum animi et corporis incolumnitate recte instituenda*, liber unus. Illi quidem iam postremum emendati, et aliquot captibus aucti: hic vero nunquam antehac editus: Auctore Levino Lemnio, Medico Zirizaeo, Ienae excudebat Tobias Steinman, Anno MDLXXXVIII. Observe the place. Jena is not often mentioned in connection with this singular book. The work was probably in print as early as 1565. The scientific part was quoted with approval by Leibnitz. In chap. xvi of the *Exhortatio ad vit. opt. instit.* the author has this to say of comedy: "Historiae affinis est comoedia humanae vitae speculum, in quo quisque mores affectusque suos atque expressam quotidianae vitae imaginem sub alterius persona perspicit ac contemplatur, suaque vitia aut virtutes observat, iocundo genere, ut Cicero ait, eleganti, urbano, ingenioso, faceto, quo exercitii genere omnes fere nationes in suo quaeque idiomate utuntur, magna nonnunquam licentia ac dicendi libertate, sic ut juxta Horatium, libertas in vitium excidat, quod in sectandis vitiis plerumque sint acerbiores: neque enim populares tantum atque infimae sortis homines notant, sed in frequentissimo civitatis theatro optimates ac viros primarios exagitant, rhythmisque asperioribus perstringunt. Qui si citra ullam contumeliam atque infamiae labem, minusque seditiosis versibus tale quiddam moliantur, atque in illas tantum, qui id sunt promeriti, linguas excuant, tolerari posse videbitur, quo morbidi illi contacto hulcere resipiscant, suique officii rationem habere meminerint. Belgae hanc comicam licentiam Batamentem vocant, ut rhythmicos concentus et modulationes, quibus fabulam suam peragunt, Rym offt Dichten."

ence as well as learning, we imagine that it reflects a state of things that was in existence as early as 1530 or before. This comedy in the Netherlands was in the vernacular, as was the folk-comedy of Italy about the close of the fifteenth century mentioned by Polydore Vergil.

To return to Choricius. Comedies were played at night, and the audiences were composed of both men and women, especially girls of the middle and upper classes. The music was popular, and the songs often passed to the streets to be sung everywhere, just as the case is now with simple and taking airs. Mimes successful in the provinces were usually invited to Constantinople to play before the imperial household. Yet they were less honored than tragic actors. Pedagogues were not permitted to attend the comedy. They revenged themselves by teaching their pupils to perform the classic comedies. Many censured the Middle Comedy for much the same reasons that are alleged against modern French plays. The answer of Choricius is one that is still in use. He argued that it was the business of the drama to expose the facts of human nature; that the final purpose of the comedy, however, was ethical; and that it represented vice as punished, folly rebuked and virtue rewarded. Christianity was studiously ignored by the orator. His attitude was meant to be that of an ancient philosopher.

For the purposes of his rhetoric the Olympian gods still reigned. This is worth remembering; for the paganism of the Renaissance in Italy is sometimes treated as if it were a novelty in the literary history of the Christian period.

So far as comedy was concerned, it may well be supposed that Choricius described what Anastasius fostered and approved. Outside of the legitimate drama, comedy and tragedy, Anastasius, like a true Greek of the classic stamp, seems to have cared for little or nothing theatrical. Among the things which he strongly condemned was the Maiouma, the May nocturnal festival of Antioch, and indeed of all Syria. This was celebrated every third year, and was prolonged for a month at a time. It retained the memory of its ancient patrons, Dionysus and Aphrodite, but in the days of Anastasius it degenerated sadly, and he ordered its discontinuance. Here again, as in prohibiting the contest with wild beasts, he acted so as to promote the interests of the theater by restoring to it the crowds which formerly roamed the streets with clowns and false-faces. The successors of Anastasius, Justin and Justinian, gave the last blow to the spectacular life of Antioch by abolishing the so-called Olympic games which had long kept alive the memory of ancient Greek athletics. The games at Antioch, however, had been changed to suit the character of a people who lived only to

be amused. Their real quality was shown when Diocletian attempted to give them religious and national significance in opposition to Christianity. Music and dancing and declamation and tricks on horseback by young men and young women of aristocratic families were a poor substitute for the strenuous contest of an earlier period. Nevertheless, the pagan subjects of the empire viewed the abolition of the Olympia as a direct challenge to the gods, and the subsequent occurrences confirmed their faith. A little while before Justinian's decree was promulgated, a tempest prostrated the sacred grove of cypresses in the gardens of Daphne. Six years afterward an earthquake tumbled the city in ruins and caused the death of 300,000 people.[1] In vain Justinian named the new town Theopolis and ordered solemn services in its behalf. The Persians captured it and transferred the remnant of the population to a new Antioch, the Antioch of Chosroes, where every effort was made for a time to preserve the learning and the arts, the theater, and the festivals, of the Greeks.

The temporary restoration of the ancient stage by Anastasius was followed, under his barbarous successor Justin, by lower abasement than ever. If we may believe Procopius, Justinian personally cared as little for the muses as his uncultured

[1] Procopius, i, 214.

uncle. His efforts to ameliorate the condition of the lower classes of women on the stage, though wise and necessary, were not intended to benefit the theater. The miseries of these women were such as can now hardly be imagined, because they were enhanced by conditions not far removed from slavery. As Eudocia had influenced her husband, Theodosius II, to free the provincial theaters and actors from the exactions of the Byzantine spectacles, so now Theodora, the former dancing-girl, influenced her husband, Justinian, to relieve the women of the stage from the horrors of servitude. Many of these women were bound by written contracts made in their name by others. Justinian declared these contracts void. The procurers substituted promises under oath, but Justinian prohibited this practice, relieved the thymelicae from the penalties of perjury, and gave them many civic rights which had hitherto been denied. He sanctioned their marriage, and when, as was to be expected, troops of them left the theaters and threw themselves upon the world without a livelihood, he provided a fund to meet their necessities. Not merely in the release of these women, but in other ways, Justinian restricted the public amusements of his subjects. According to Procopius, he abolished the laws under which the imperial treasury defrayed the expense of performances in the Hippodrome, the Cynegion, and certain smaller

theaters. The Byzantines are said to have lamented in particular the closing of these theaters, thinking that they must thenceforth live without laughter. But these places were evidently not the ones where the legitimate comedy and tragedy prevailed, but rather those in which dancers and buffoons were supreme. It was, in fact, from the class of dancers that he rescued the woman who became his empress; and while he is not to be credited with literary or artistic sensibility, his reprisals in her behalf would have missed their aim, if they had been as indiscriminate as in general were the attacks of orthodoxy. The case of Theodora, whatever view may be taken of her character, was in her youth sad enough. Owing to the poverty of her parents and to their lifelong connection with the Hippodrome, she and her sister, both said to have been very beautiful women, had not even the wretched privilege of being hired by contract as dancers or actresses. They were, as one might say, chattels of the Hippodrome, and could be leased by that establishment to any employer who would pay for their professional services. Once freed from this degrading slavery, she never rested until she had released her former companions from their forced and abominable trade. That her efforts to abolish the shows (*θεάματα*) were not directed against the legitimate stage is indicated by the fact that certain moneys paid

into the public treasury, particularly the fees for building permits, were reserved to the theatralia during Justinian's reign. This theatric fund implied the continued existence of the objects to which it was applied. The only restrictions in the novels of Justinian which could have applied to the legitimate comedy were those that forbade bishops and monks to frequent the theater and commanded the actors to cease their ridicule of the monastic dress. John Lydus a historian of the period, wrote that, while the vulgar theaters were closed—namely, those in which were performed the farces and buffooneries of the Atellane, the Palliata, the Togata, the Tabernaria, the Rhinthonice, and the Planipedaria—the stage of the mimes was carefully protected. Another work which casts light on the condition of the Byzantine stage at this time as well as earlier is the *Anthology of Epigrams.*[1] In this collection

[1]Sathas cites the following titles of epigrams of this kind: Εἰς εἰκόνα Μαρίας τῆς κιθαρῳδοῦ ἐν Βυζαντίῳ—Εἰς εἰκόνα Θεοδωριάδος—Εἰς εἰκόνα ὀρχηστρίδος Ῥοδοκλείας—Εἰς εἰκόνα ὀρχηστρίδος Ἑλλαδίης ἱσταμένης ἐν τῷ Σωσθενίῳ—Εἰς ὀρχηστρίδος εἰκόνα διάχρυσον ἐν Βυζαντίῳ. He also quotes the following which may be of use to those who have not access to a collection of these Greek versicles:

Νηλεὴς Ἀΐδης ἐπὶ δ' ἐγέλασε θανόντι
Τίτυρε, καὶ νεκύων θῆκέ σε μιμολόγον.

Κωμικὸν ἀμφιέπω Θάλεια μέλος, ἔργα δὲ φωτῶν
οὐχ ὁσίων θυμέλησι φιλοκροτάλοισιν ἀθύρῳ

Σιγᾶς, Χρυσεόμαλλε, τὸ χάλκεον, οὐκ ἔτι δ' ἡμῖν
εἰκόνας ἀρχεγόνων ἐκτελέεις μερόπων
νεύμασιν ἀφθόγγοισιν· τεὴ δ', ὀλβιστε, σιωπὴ
νῦν στυγερὴ τελέθει, τῇ πρὶν ἐθελγόμεθα.

Ἕκτορα μέν τις ἄεισε νέον μέλος· Ἑλλαδίη δὲ
ἐσσαμένη χλαίναν πρὸς μέλος ἠντίασεν·
ἦν δὲ πόθος καὶ δεῖμα παρ' ὀρχηθμοῖσιν Ἐνυοῦς·
ἄρσενι γὰρ ῥώμῃ θῆλυν ἔμιξε χάριν

the names of many actors are preserved, and various allusions reveal the customs and tastes of the mediaeval Hellenized races with reference to the drama and the theater. If the social features of Byzantine theatrical life often resemble those

Αὐτὸν ὁρᾷν Ἰόβακχον ἐδόξαμεν ἡνίκα ληνοῖς
ὁ πρέσβυς νεαρῆς ἦρχε χοροιμανίης,
καὶ Κάδμου τὰ πάρηβα χορεύματα καὶ τὸν ἀφ' ὕλης
ἄγγελον εὐίακῶν ἰχνηλάτην θιάσων,
καὶ τὴν εὐάζουσαν ἐν αἵματι παιδὸς Ἀγαύην
λυσσάδα. Φεῦ, θείης ἀνδρὸς ὑποκρισίης

Τὸν σοβαρὸν Πολέμωνα, τὸν ἐν θυμέλῃσι Μένανδρον
κείραντα Γλυκέρας τῆς ἁλόχου πλοκάμους,
ὁπλότερος Πολέμων μιμήσατο καὶ τὰ Ῥοδάνθης
βόστρυχα παντόλμοις χερσὶν ἐληΐσατο,
καὶ τραγικοῖς ἀχέεσσι τὸ κομικὸν ἔργον ἀμείψας
μάστιξεν ῥαδινῆς ἄψεα θηλυτέρας.

Εἴ ποτε μὲν κιθάρας ἐπαφήσατο πλῆκτρον ἑλοῦσα
κούρη, Τερψιχόρης ἀντεμέλιζε μίτοις·
εἶποτε δὲ τραγικῷ ῥοιζήματι ῥῆξατο φωνὴν
αὐτῆς Μελπομένης βόμβον ἀπεπλάσατο·
εἰ δὲ καὶ ἀγλαίης κρίσις ἵστατο, μᾶλλον ἂν αὐτὴ
Κύπρις ἐνικήθη κἀνεδίκαζε Πάρις·
σιγῇ ἐφ' ἡμείων, ἵνα μὴ Διόνυσος ἀκούσας
τῶν Ἀριαδνείων ζῆλον ἔχοι λεχέων.

Πᾶσαν ἐγὼ τὴν νύκτα κινύρομαι· εὗτε δ' ἀπέλθῃ
ὄρθρος ἑλινῦσαι μικρὰ χαριζόμενος,
ἀμφιπεριτρύζουσι χελιδόνες, ἐς δέ με δάκρυ
βάλλουσιν, γλυκερὸν κῶμα παρωσάμεναι.
ὄμματα δὲ σταλάοντα φυλάσσεται· ἡ δὲ Ῥοδάνθης
αὐθις ἐμοῖς στέρνοις φροντὶς ἀναστρέφεται·
ὦ φθονεραὶ παύσασθε λαλητρίδες· οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε
τὴν Φιλομηλείην γλῶσσαν ἀπειθρισάμην·
ἀλλ' Ἴτυλον κλαίοιτε κατ' οὔρεα, καὶ γοάοιτε
εἰς ἕποπος κραναὴν αὖλιν ἐφεζόμεναι,
βαιὸν ἵνα κνώσσοιμεν· ἴσως δέ τις ἥξει ὄνειρος,
ὅς με Ῥοδανθείοις πήχεσιν ἀμφιβάλοι.

Ἦ ῥά γε καὶ σύ, Φίλιννα, φέρεις πόνον, ἦ ῥα καὶ αὐτὴ
κάμνεις, αὐαλέοις ὄμμασι τηκομένη;
ἦ σὺ μὲν ὕπνον ἔχεις γλυκερώτατον, ἠμετέρης δὲ
φροντίδος οὔτε λόγος γίγνεται, οὔτ' ἀριθμός;
εὑρήσεις τάχ' ὅμοια, τεὴν δ', ἀμέγαρτε, παρειὴν
ἀθρήσω θαμινοῖς δάκρυσι τεγγομένην.
Κύπρις γὰρ τὰ μὲν ἄλλα παλίγκοτος· ἓν δέ τι καλὸν
ἔλλαχεν, ἐχθαίρειν τὰς σοβαρευομένας.

Ἦ πάρος ἀγλαΐῃσι μετάρσιος, ἡ πλοκαμῖδας
σειομένη πλεκτὰς καὶ σοβαρευομένη,
ἡ μεγαλαυχήσασα καθ' ἡμετέρης μελεδώνης,
γήραϊ ῥικνωθὴς τὴν πρὶν ἀφῆκε χάριν·
μαζὸς ὑπεκλίνθη, πέσον ὀφρύες, ὄμμα τέτηκται,
χείλεα βαμβαίνει φθέγματι γηραλέῳ·
τὴν πολιὴν καλέω Νέμεσιν Πόθου, ὅττι δικάζει
ἔννομα ταῖς σοβαραῖς θάσσον ἐπερχομένη.

of classic times, hardly less often do they seem like those of a more modern era. The Byzantine actresses who sighed for a rich husband were probably not the last of their kind; nor are the

> Τῇ Παφίῃ στεφάνους, τῇ Παλλάδι τὴν πλοκαμῖδα,
> Ἀρτέμιδι ζώνην ἄνθετο Καλιῤῥόη·
> εὗρετο γὰρ μνηστῆρα τὸν ἤθελε, καὶ λάχεν ἤβην
> σώφρωνα, καὶ τεκέων ἄρσεν ἔτικτε γένος.
>
> Πορφυρὶς ἡ Κνιδίη τὰ στέμματα καὶ τὸ δίθυρσον
> τοῦτο τὸ λογχωτόν, καὶ τὸ περισφύριον,
> οἷς ἀνέδην βάκχευεν ὅτ' ἐς Διόνυσον ἐφοίτα
> κισσωτὴν στέρνοις νεβρίδ' ἀναπτομένη,
> ἁβροκόμη Διόνυσε, πρὸ παστάδος ᾠρώησεν
> ταῦτα· τὰ τοῦ κάλλους κόσμια καὶ μανίης.

Sathas, of course, maintains that all these had a contemporary application. Perhaps other critics might have doubts in some cases. He also enumerates from the epigrams the following additional names of mimads: Bassaris, Rhodope, Galatea, Demo, Doris, Sappho, Lais, Charicle, Theodoria, Menecratis, Theano, Paphia, Cleophantis, Hermonassa, Maria the citharode, Plato also a citharist, Porphyris a tragedian, and the dancers (*orchestridae*) Rhodoclea, Caramallus Libania, and Anthusa. The argument is obvious that, if such professional persons existed in the time of Agathias, they must have had dramas to perform and theaters to perform in. While upon this subject, one may well copy a little from Vavassor, whose elaborate study *De epigrammate* is still worthy of admiration. On p. 125 of his collected works he attributes to Meleager, a predecessor of Agathias and Planudes, and a contemporary as well as a subject of Seleucus VI:

> Ἡδὺ μέλος νὴ Πᾶνα τ' Ἀρκάδα πηκτίδι μέλπεις
> ζηνοφίλα λίγει, ἀδὺ κρέκεις τι μέλος,
> ποῖ σε φύγω; πάντῃ με περιστείχουσιν ἔρωτες,
> οὐδ' ὅσον ἀμπνεῦσαι βαιὸν ἐῶσι χρόνον.
> ἡ γάρ μοι μορφὴ βάλλει πόθον· ἡ πάλι μοῦσα·
> ἢ Χάρις· ἢ τί λέγω πάντα; πυριφλέγομαι.

There is certainly a family resemblance between this piece and those cited from a later period by Sathas. Vavassor also cites from Agathias himself an epigram that seems to cast a doubt on the first-hand quality of his observation (122):

> Ὅσσα καὶ βιότοιο πολυσπερέεσσι κελεύθοις
> γράψαμεν ἀσταθέος τε τύχης σφαλεροῖσι ταλάντοις,
> δέρκεό μοι βιβλίῳ παρὰ κρηπῖδα τετάρτην.
> καὶ τάχα καὶ πέμπτοιο χάρις θέλξειεν ἀεθλου,
> ὁππόθι κερτομέοντες ἐπεσβόλον ἦχον ἀοιδῆς
> γράψαμεν ἐκταῖον δὲ μέλος κλέπτουσα κυθήρη
> εἰς ὄαρους ἐλέγοιο παρατρέψειε πορείην
> καὶ γλυκεροὺς ἐς ἔρωτας, ἐν ἑβδομάτῃ δὲ μελίσσῃ
> εὐφροσύνας βάκχοιο, φιλακρήτους τε χορείας,
> καὶ μέθυ, καὶ κρητῆρα, καὶ ὀλβια δεῖπνα νοήσεις.

watchful mothers who guarded the good name of their daughters by their indefatigable attention without modern counterparts.

V

That the legitimate stage, tragedy and comedy and the politer pantomime, continued to flourish under the successors of Justinian may be inferred from the following more or less direct evidence.[1] The sophists and lawyers had, as has been remarked, close relations with the theater. They were usually the writers of the epigrams on actors and actresses in the *Anthology*. The sophists of Gaza taught their acroamatic art in the theater of that city. The lawyers, or at least the professors of law, seem to have done likewise at Constantinople about the close of the seventh century, since the Council in Trullo found it necessary to prohibit the resort of law-teachers to the theaters. The lawyer and historian Menander obtained his name from his youthful predilection for the stage. He neglected his profession for that of the playwright. Later in life, in the time of emperor Maurice, having retired from the theater, he devoted himself to writing a history, of which, unfortunately, only a few fragments are known to exist. The work doubtless included much information about the theater, owing to Menander's familiarity with the

[1] Sathas, τξδ', τξθ', τσ', τοε'.

36139

subject. In a fragment which has been preserved, he mentioned the fact that in the year 591 he wrote a tragedy on the martyrdom of the Persian magus, Isaozites,[1] who, having become a Christian, was crucified by the Zoroastrians. Here we have an obvious prototype of the Jesuit religio-historic Latin dramas and a faint foreshadowing of the Shakespearian histories. That Menander wrote other dramas besides the one he mentions seems probable from the tenor of many fragments attributed to him which could hardly have found a place in his history.

Until the time of the emperor Heraclius the theater must have survived undisturbed, since we find that emperor endeavoring to subsidize what may be called the theatric interest in the state to secure its support in his contest with other ambitious leaders. He placated the warring factions of the Hippodrome by setting apart, out of the reduced revenues of the empire, a fund for an annual performance. The Iconoclastic emperors in general, contrary to what might have been expected of men who had imbibed a prejudice almost Semitic against art in the form of pictures or statuary, supported the theater. Of course, the

[1] Vossius, *De historicis Graecis*, p. 275; Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, Vol. VI, p. 236; Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur*, pp. 373 f., where there is an ample synopsis of Plochiras' little play. For proof that Θάνατος τοῦ Χριστοῦ was known in renascent Italy, Sathas refers to Gyraldus and his *Dialogus de poetarum historia*, VIII.

bitterness of religious controversy had much to do with this. In the Hippodrome the mimes satirized the orthodox monks and patriarchs; among other things representing them as disobeying those very injunctions about marriage and intercourse of the sexes which the last orthodox council, the Council in Trullo, had embodied in its canons. Indeed, the monks themselves were obliged to enact their own disgrace. Constantine Copronymus gathered them in the arena and compelled each to take a female companion. His prefect in Thrace was equally stern. He collected all the monastics, male and female, of his province and said to them: "Get married at once. Those who refuse shall be blinded and sent to Cyprus." These high-handed proceedings were fatal to the cause of the image-breakers. The Iconoclasts also weakened their party by the introduction of the theater into the church. Moderate churchmen, who would have been reconciled to the loss of the icons, were not ready for noisy dramatic performances associated with worship. Of the character of these religious interludes nothing is known. The orthodox party, as soon as it regained power, effaced every vestige of Iconoclastic literature that could be found. Of the Byzantine dramas which have survived, only one can be referred to this period—a short dialogue in verse by Michael Plochiras. It embodied the complaint of a philosopher against the

vagaries of fortune, and was written according to the rules of the ancient drama. In addition to the characters of the dialogue, Agroecus, Sophus, and Tyche, the piece included two choral parts, of which one was sung by the muses. Of this play, and others of its kind known to Byzantine letters, Magnin remarked that they appeared to be the precursors and models of the moralities of the West.

Orthodox writers were now, as on similar occasions before, compelled to follow the example of the heretics. John of Damascus in his early days collected the dicta of the Fathers against the stage. Now he set to work to compose dramas in order to gratify tastes that were stronger among the people than theological hatreds. One of these plays was based on the story of Susanna. It no longer exists, but is said to have been modeled after the tragedies of Euripides. Another orthodox dramatist was Stephen Sabaites, who was already famous for his hymns. He wrote at least one tragedy, the Θάνατος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, a work which may have been suggested by the earlier Χριστὸς Πάσχων. Stephen's drama, after the lapse of centuries, appears to have been still well known to Greek men of letters at the time of the revival of learning in Italy. A third writer contemporary with John and Stephen, of the same ecclesiastical party, was the deacon Ignatius who composed a short miracle-play on

the temptation of Adam and Eve and their expulsion from Paradise. This appears to have been a work on the lines of the comedy played by the mimes. A prologue outlined the drama, which began with a conversation between Eve and the Serpent. The other characters were Adam and God. The natural result of this orthodox dramatic activity was that the severe canons of the Council in Trullo had to be explained away. Later scholiasts, Balsamon and Zonaras, referred these decrees exclusively to the spectacles of the Hippodrome. Zonaras insisted that the Fathers, in condemning tragedy and comedy, alluded only to the practice of ridiculing monks on the stage, and added that the ecclesiastics of former times could know nothing of Aristophanes or Euripides. This was almost as bad as the modern assertion that nobody read Terence in the Middle Ages. Balsamon gave a volume of information in a few sentences when he blamed the monks for making themselves ridiculous by appearing as clowns and satyrs in the market-place at the Calandae. For this is as much as to say the spirit of play had not only domesticated itself in the church—Balsamon wrote after the mummeries of St. Sophia had ceased to be looked on as an innovation—but that it rendered nugatory the severe ascetic discipline of centuries. The Greeks were still practically the same people that had danced to the goat-song of Thespis. Paradoxical

above all the rest was the fact that the church now tacitly approved as not unorthodox the very performances—for example, the Kontopaikte—which owed their origin to Julian the Apostate.

The lawyers followed the example of these scholiasts. Inconvenient decrees had been promulgated in the fervor of victorious piety by the emperors who followed immediately after the Iconoclasts. By the lawyers it was held that the disgrace which these decrees aimed to put on the profession of the mime as such was only incidental to the purpose of the individual, as when a person went on the stage to gratify a feeling of revenge or hatred. Hardly had the study of the law risen in the West to the rank of a science before this histrionic problem recurred, not on lines which might have been anticipated from the capitularies of Charlemagne and his successors, or from the traditional attitude of the Latin church, but taken up at the point where the Byzantine jurisprudents had left it. Tiraqueau[1] raised the question whether the profession of an actor was a bar to nobility. Confessedly disagreeing with the *Decreta canonica*, he distinguished *histriones* from *tibicines*, *citharoedi*, *citharistae*, *lyristae* and others who played on various instruments at weddings and other festivities, who, he said, were called *lusores*, "players," and were publicly hired

[1] Tiraqueau, *De nobilitate*, pp. 271 ff.

for the purpose. These were vile and infamous, according to the *Decreta canonica* which condemned all actors as goliards and buffoons. Tiraqueau held to a more moderate view. He included with *histriones*, also tragedians, comedians, *mimi*, *pantomimi*, and *archimimi*, as if he would ask for all these some indulgence from the law. As to those who by legal writers, contrary to the usage of Cicero and other classic authors, were called *joculatores*—the French *farseurs* or *joueurs de farses*—he admitted that, as they played publicly for money, their infamy, legally considered, was unquestionable. He added that Budaeus, commenting on the clause, "omnes propter praemium in scenam descendentes famosus esse," included with these also those who went on the stage from motives of ambition, quoting the authority of a Greek manuscript in the Vatican. But Tiraqueau carefully reserved the point that in all the adverse cases, what was unlawful in the street, was, for a good purpose, quite admissible within private walls, and also observed that the distinctive customs of each country were to be considered. There was an unconscious touch of humor in the gravity with which he dwelt on the classic paradox that it was proper to sing or dance, but highly improper to sing or dance too well. The result of modern discussion on the subject has been a gradual amelioration in the status of the

player. So in Byzantium all the repressive decrees were replaced at the last by one which opened the right of contest in the games to all. Then, as the revenues of the fading state decreased, came the half-pathetic imperial declaration that the theoric funds might be used in repairing the walls, since upon the strength of the walls depended the continuance of the theater. It was to the emperors of the Macedonian house that actors were indebted for relief from their civic deprivations. Constantine VIII Porphyrogenitus even ventured to revive national festivals—perhaps he merely recognized anew what had not ceased to exist—which had long lain under the censure of the church. Bacchus reappeared under another name, and then it was found that in Thrace his rites had never been neglected. In the tenth century the stage recovered its power in such measure as to show that the anti-theatric crusade of a thousand years had never been strong enough to uproot from the human heart those ideas of pleasure which were natural to it. Even the church, as we have seen, betrayed a feeling of reaction against the ascetic monotony which it had itself created.

To judge from the silence of later writers, the peace between the church and the theaters lasted unbroken until the fall of the Byzantine Empire. The theatric question as such no longer existed. But the theaters remained in some form, for Pho-

tius and Psellus found it convenient to distinguish between the use and abuse of them. The latter, joking with his pupils, upbraided them for preferring the play to the school, and in a suit at law he formally recorded by his petition the fact that mimes and clowns still existed. His poetical discourse on grammar,[1] addressed to Constantine Monomachus, was illustrated by the citation of at least one dramatic poet, Lycophron, that perhaps indicated an oral corruption of a passage in that author. It was not grammar, he wrote, that saw,

Τὰς γὰρ ἐν τῷ Λυκόφρονι εὐῶπας κόρας κώπας.

The inference is that Lycophron still held the memory of men in some fashion. His place may not, however, have been the stage. The epigrammatists of the *Anthology* had their quarrel with him, the only dramatist, they said, whose name and nature agreed. Wolf-minded he was called, and wolf-minded he was in thinking dark thoughts. Somewhat later than Psellus, John Tzetzes congratulated actors on being more honored than teachers, and even on being credited with more wisdom. Theodore Prodromus, in a lively poem which may have been intended for recitation as part of a stage performance, poured contempt on Aristotle, Empedocles, and Orpheus for not being able to keep him from starving, and expressed the

[1] Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, Vol. III, p. 208.

determination to abandon his books for the theater. He is known to have written *acta* for the mimes of the Hippodrome, besides having collaborated in the authorship of the more pretentious and better-known drama Ἀπόθημος φιλία. This was a sort of morality in which Philia (Friendship) was cast off by her husband Cosmos (Human Life), who then married the lewd Echthra (Enmity) by the advice of his handmaid Moria, or Folly. This reminds one in a general way of the farce produced in 1524 by the French physician Nicole de la Chesnaye,[1] in which World as an impersonation of mankind weds, not Wrath, but Folly herself. Tzetzes indicated by some lines in his *Chiliads* that actors still continued in his time to take part in the Calandae as of old. He also gave occasion for the inference that a revival had taken place of the tragedies of Sophocles as acting plays. However, the Comneni were not invariably favorable to the theater, and when the reigning emperor happened to be adverse, the dramatic profession had reason for invoking the shade of Sophocles to witness the miseries of his successors.

A playwright of this period who wrote certain satiric dramas in his youth is noteworthy for the reason that he spent his later years in burning all the copies of his plays which he could find, leav-

[1] Minor, *Medicine in the Middle Ages;* extracts from *Le moyen âge médical* of Dr. Edmond Dupouy, p. 91.

ing on record the titles of four which would probably now be called farces. This was Nicephorus the Basilaces. While Basilaces and Prodromus composed *acta* for the mimes, Manuel Phile wrote rather stilted allegorical dramas in honor of his imperial and noble patrons. He seems to have anticipated, in a dry and clumsy way, the masque which was for a time dear to the courtly amateurs of the West. In one of his poems, of a somewhat different cast from those mentioned, he introduced himself as the principal character, and in the person of an old friend described the training and peculiarities of an experienced mime. Among other things this poem—which is said to be very obscure even to a Greek—shows that the actors still wore the ancient masks, at least in comic performances. Exhibiting a universal trait of human nature, Phile thought no actors so good as those whom he had known in his youth. In another poem, where mimes were introduced under evident stage names, the discussion turned on money. Anyone who has observed the modern actor looking for an angel should be able to appreciate the phrase Πακτωλέ μου. One of Phile's semi-allegorical dramas was a eulogy of the great Domestic and historian, John Cantacuzene. Phile himself appears in this play conversing with Mind. The virtues are represented by twelve women bearing such names as Courage, Judgment, Prudence, and

the like, the final speech being in the name of Cantacuzene himself. Another piece in dramatic form was the so-called monody on the death of John Palaeologus. The prologue was spoken by a character named Therapon, while eulogistic themes were allotted to the different members of the mourning imperial family. This example of polite and solemn flattery was not forgotten. In the year 1637 the Italian Antonius Persianes wrote a similar funeral drama on the death of Christine, duchess of Lorraine. A dramatic threnody which might be recited by one person or by several is the Latin poem by Huet on the death of Salmasius.[1] The hundred distichs in Latin by the three sisters, Anne, Jane, and Margaret Seymour, on the death of Margaret of Valois,[2] furnish a curious variation of the funeral drama; all the more so as each Latin couplet has its echoes in Greek, Latin, and French, written by various poets.

Throughout the period of the Palaeologi, persons with the traditions and training of actors continued to take the customary parts in the secular and religious spectacles; they attended the procession of the patriarchs, led the popular merriment of the Carnival (Ἀπόκρεες) in the

[1] Olivetus, *Recentiores poetae Latini et Graeci selecti quinque* (Frankfort, 1743).

[2] Brydges, *Polyanthea*, Art. VI, pp. 80 ff. Bayle gives an article to these distichs.

Calandae, and probably the dances in the Feast of the Virgin (κοίμησις) which lasted thirty days. The fashion of the emperors in surrounding themselves with mimes, dancers, and musicians was so deeply rooted that the Turkish sultans continued it with Byzantine actors, as the Turks and Arabs at the time of the conquest and long afterward were skilled only in the arts of the acrobat, their music and dance being unfit for the combinations required by the stage. In all Toderini's three volumes on Turkish literature there is not a line respecting the drama. It was not until a time almost within the memory of men now living that Turkish poets mastered the art of the playwright, beginning with rude adaptations to the stage of stories from the *Thousand and One Nights*, passing to paraphrases from modern French dramas and on to works more or less original and national.

VI

It may be suspected that the mimes in the last years of the empire, since they left no record of any dramatic performance properly so called, were no longer like their ancient namesakes. Ducange preserves a definition which shows that the mimes were sometimes called ἀρχαιολόγοι as well as βιολόγοι—that is, impersonators of ancient as well as contemporary life.[1] But this definition might have

[1] Sathas, ρλε', ν', υβ', ρη', υιδ', λα'.

been a literary reminiscence. Psellus, in the time of the Comneni, discriminated clearly between the clowns of the imperial court and the buffoons of the Hippodrome, and Zonaras insisted on the fact that the mimes in his day were precisely like those of earlier times. To make this more certain, he distinguished the σκηνικοὶ from the μίμοι by saying that the former were always associated with the ballet (ὄρχησις), while the mimes played comedies. From what Phile says it is plain that the mimes as late as the closing thirteenth century still gave the same kind of an entertainment as that so bitterly censured by Chrysostom a thousand years before. Eustathius of Thessalonica in his study of gesture remarked that the actors whom he knew, besides producing contemporary dramas, often revived those of ancient authors. The contemporary pieces to which Eustathius alludes were not preserved; but an adequate idea can be formed of them from some descriptions. According to Choricius, the mimes gathered in the Hippodrome presented their *acta* in the intervals between the games. His words imply also that these *acta* were mostly satirical, and that they were very direct in their application. Now, to illustrate: The cause of the uprising against the emperor Maurice is unknown. But from the popular song which has been preserved it is to be inferred that the first

signal of rebellion was given by the actors, who marched in front of the emperor's place in the Hippodrome singing an insolent ditty and pointing to one of their number made up to look like Maurice—who was far from beauty—but crowned with a wreath of garlic. The joke was fatal to Maurice, but it had its counterpart long before in the time of Theodosius II. Phocas the successor of Maurice, was satirized, likewise in his own presence, for his habitual drunkenness. The terrible effectiveness of these one-act satires is evinced by the well-known story of an official who was burned alive in the oval of the Hippodrome,[1] upon the disclosure by the mimes of an oppressive act on his part which had not before come to the knowledge of the reigning emperor Theophilus. Inasmuch as a similar scene had taken place in the reign of the emperor Valentinian, the natural inference is that the mimes had not forgotten their traditions. In fact, satires upon rulers and politicians in the theater appear to have grown more frequent with time. The literary princess Anna Comnena, for example, gave a long account of the scenic attacks on her father, including some of the songs that were sung.[2]

In the time of Justinian the ancient rattles (*βομβωνάρια*), which had been familiar to the

[1] Grosvenor, *Constantinople*, Vol. I, p. 337.

[2] Anna Comnena, *Alexias*, Vol. XII, p. 361 (Paris, edition).

ceremonies of the old religion, were used by the mimes to ridicule the remaining adherents of paganism. These noisy instruments were kept in mind to that age, as something more or less sacred, by the Olympic Games at Antioch; young girls discoursed on philosophy, entered various contests, and rattled bombonaria because it was classical to do those things. Aeschylus, they were told, had introduced the bombyx or crotalum in his tragedy, the Ἠδονοί. But when the mimes took up the instrument, its ridiculous character was exposed. It is still heard in the isles of Greece, but only on the days when it is supposed to buzz contempt for the memory of Judas Iscariot.[1]

A more significant dramatic survival remains to be mentioned. Constantine Porphyrogenitus, of the Macedonian dynasty, was distinguished for his recognition and encouragement of the plays of the guilds, the forerunners, and perhaps the models, of the Mysteries performed by the artisans of the West. These companies of workingmen, with their songs, dialogues, and pantomimes, under his patronage, took an important share in every ecclesiastical and civic festival, and preserved their traditions for ages. As late as the close of the eighteenth century, Epirote and Macedonian butchers of Constantinople performed annually a pantomime with chorus which was interpreted to

[1] Tozer, *The Islands of the Aegean*, p. 82.

be a scenic representation of the expedition of Alexander against Darius. This traditional play, according to Constantine himself, contained two famous lines:

Ἴδε τὸ ἔαρ τὸ καλὸν πάλιν ἐπανατέλλει
φέρον ὑγείαν καὶ χαρὰν καὶ τὴν εὐημερίαν.

The similarity has been pointed out of these verses to the Italian,

Ben venga Maggio
Che a ciascun rallegra il cuore,

in the popular plays of Florence and more particularly to the *Ben venga Primavera* in a song composed either by Lorenzo de' Medici or Angelo Politiano.[1] The comparison might seem far-fetched, if the Greek lines were a fragment of mere local folklore. But they had been in better days a part of the ceremonies of the Hippodrome.[2]

Except in times of disorder or disaffection, the people would greet their sovereign with a hymn appropriate to the season and the day, those on the right intoning one line, those on the left the next. Thus on the 11th of May in one great wave of sound would roll out from the East,

"Behold, the Spring, the goodly Spring once more appears."

Then from the Western side would swell back the chorus,

"Prosperity and joy and health it brings."

[1] Roscoe, *The Life of Lorenzo de' Medici* (second edition), Vol. I, p. 131 of the Appendix.

[2] Grosvenor, *Constantinople*, Vol. I, p. 335.

So they would continue ringing out line after line of that ancient hymn inwrought into the life of the Hippodrome, of which we have only the beginning.

It was this time-honored lyric which the guild of butchers preserved long after the Hippodrome had fallen into ruins and its stones had been carried away to make the walls of new buildings. The myriads who once faced each other in all the glory of their party costumes had dwindled to a small company of two or three hundred men, but these stood on the very ground over which the walls of the Hippodrome had towered centuries before. For almost a thousand years the same pantomimic drama had been represented on the same stage in the same city by the same corps of artisans.[1]

In the more prosperous times of the empire a favorite business with the artisan actors of Constantinople was the presentation of Homeric scenes, particularly at feasts and weddings. What the source was from which this folk-theater drew its Homeric legends is not easy to tell, but there are indications that it was identical with that from which those western redactors of the Trojan story obtained the innumerable episodes of which Homer never dreamed. What happens in most periods

[1] Sathas may be wrong in his reference on this matter. According to Fabricius, who gives a complete list of the chapter headings of Constantine's manuscript on imperial tactics and ceremonies, the chapter devoted to the Butchers' Hippodrome is I, 73, not 83. It appears that this Μακελλαρικὸν Ἱπποδρόμιον was supposed to be the equivalent of the Roman Lupercalia.

of high culture happened also in Byzantium. Our modern affection for ballads and folklore and dialect was rivaled by similar predilections in the polished society of the Eastern Empire. The ecclesiastical verse of the learned poets, Eudocia, Basil, Nonnus, St. Gregory, Synesius, Pisides, Phile, and others, all met the same fate. None of these succeeded in writing what was permanently acceptable to the liturgy of the church. Nearly all the hymns that are now sung were made by folk-poets, or at least by men who were never known to Byzantine learning. The persistent aversion of the church from the learned poesy and its warm esteem for the popular muse had an important effect on the Greek language. Poets of the schools were affected by a tendency which was really that of the people rather than of the church. The same feeling which led Prior to admire the ballad of "The Nut-Brown Maid" actuated Byzantine men of letters long ago, and the same perverted taste which led him to spoil that poem by improving it inspired similar efforts among Greek scholars. A feature of the Feast of Roses at Gaza was an acroamatic contest in which both students and teachers took part. Some of the poems preserved which were recited on these occasions are still of value as versions of ballads, as in the case of an anacreontic ode by Constantine the grammarian, which was based on a song

heard at a wedding. If the ballads themselves had been preserved, these secondary poems would be of slight utility. Homer was indestructible. Probably to his survival the world owes the disappearance of a mass of balladry and improvements on ballads, all of which took its rise from his verse. Procopius is said to have elaborated a whole volume of poems paraphrased into the literary language of his day from the works of Homer. Doubtless other poets, learned and unlearned, engaged in a similar task. Considerations of this kind suggest the origin of the Homeric ballads which are known to have been sung at weddings and banquets by the mimes of Constantinople.

Such poetical narratives preserved only in the memory of the minstrels were easily forgotten when they ceased to attract the people. Meanwhile it is possible that they contributed to the growth of the Trojan story in another direction.[1] Poets of the West in crusading times confessedly drew from a Greek popular source material for their compositions. That the mediaeval Troy legend was based, not on Homer alone, but in part on the narratives attributed to Dictys and Dares, is well known. But these two works by no means furnished all the materials of the western romance, as a comparison between them and the poem of Benoît de St. Maur, or the prose fiction of Guido,

[1] Warton, *History of English Poetry* (Hazlitt's edition), Vol. II, p. 128.

shows. Subtracting from Guido's *Historia de bello Trojano* all that he could have drawn from Homer, from Dictys and Dares, from Vergil, Ovid, Statius, and Valerius Flaccus—if Valerius was known then, which is doubtful—there is still much to be accounted for in his fifteen books. Warton intimates that he drew on his own imagination. But a compiler is not usually an imaginative man. Guido wrote at the instance of an archbishop, Matteo di Porta of Salerno. Salerno was the one place in all Italy, and indeed in all the West of Europe, where it is certain that the Greek language was vernacular from imperial times down to the origin of universities. When the archbishop of Salerno asked Guido to write a book, he did so evidently because he knew him to be a clever poet and a learned civilian who could write well. When he chose the subject, he was probably influenced by the knowledge that he could furnish Guido with what he considered new and important material. Neither of the two men would have cared, even in that uncritical age, to deal with a purely Greek theme, in a region full of Greek thought and Greek traditions, on the basis of their capacity for creating fiction. If they had done this, their contemporaries would have resented it. The mediaeval objection to Homer was that he falsified history. This shows the ignorance of people in the Middle Ages, but it also shows their temper. Guido could

use bad authorities, but authorities of some kind he had to have. His book was an immense success. It superseded Dictys and Dares, and held the supremacy until the real Homer began again to be studied in his own language. Achilles, Jason, and Hercules took their place as heroes of romance alongside of Lancelot, Roland, Gawain, Oliver, Arthur and Charlemagne; and the Homeric legends in their corrupted form became as popular with the guilds of Florence as they had ever been with those of Byzantium. To the tendency which reached the West in Guido, the world owes much of Boccaccio and Gower and at least one poem of Chaucer, as well as a play by Shakespeare.

VII

While, as has been said, the ecclesiastico-theatrical fashions of Byzantium passed to western Europe over the heads of the Italians and in spite of their dislike, the reverse was the case with the professional traditions of the mimes and play-wrights.[1] The Turkish conquest practically destroyed every remnant in Constantinople of the ancient culture which had survived the Graeco-Roman imperialism. To adopt the phrase of the learned John Argyropulus, the Hellenic muses, leaving their age-long habitations, migrated to

[1] Sathas, νγ', νδ': "Eheu Graecia nostro exilio transvolavit Alpes" (Argyropulus quoted by Lizelius).

the Alps. In fact, though very inaccurately, the Renaissance in western Europe is usually dated from the fall of the Byzantine power. One of the relics of ancient civilization, the transfer of which to the West was completed at that time, was undoubtedly the Greek stage tradition. That this, hitherto, even where it affected the West, had never been clearly understood is suggested, if not proved, by the fact that a man so widely informed as Dante[1] used the word "comedy" without any

[1] With Dante's remark as an objective point, Cloetta has gathered up and commented seriatim on the successive definitions of comedy and tragedy from Boethius onward. But the result is not conclusive, Dante was fitting a definition to a very unique purpose, and something can also be said for the writers who preceded him. Thus Cloetta, *Beiträge zur Litteraturgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance* (Vol. I, p. 17), quotes from the *Consolationes* of Boethius this passage, prosa 2. 36 ff.: "Quid tragoediarum clamor aliud deflet nisi indiscreto ictu fortunam felicia regna vententem? Nonne adluscentulus δοιοὺς πίθους τὸν μὲν ἕνα κακῶν τὸν δὲ ἕτερον ἐάων (Homer, *Il.* xxiv, 527 f.), in Jovis limine iacere didicisti;" and opines that it confirmed an error of the Middle Ages as to what tragedy really was. But there was not necessarily an error in the mediaeval mind. The oral peculiarities were not likely to be dwelt on in an age when all publication was oral. Recitation by one or by many was not thought of as differentiated on that account, while the purpose of the piece, as being mournful or the reverse, didactic, narratory, argumentative, prosaic or rhythmical, was always observed. The fact that only a small portion of literature in modern times is intended for oral delivery unquestionably leads critics of the present day to minimize the knowledge of the mediaeval period. Dante's portraits do not give the impression of a man capable of laughter; if he could laugh, he certainly would do so on reading some modern inferences from his definition of comedy. But that is no reason why the text to which this note is appended should depart from the orthodoxy of the literary historians. On the other hand, it is not wise to be too literal with a passage like that of Isidore, *Origines*, viii, 7, 7, where he says that there are two kinds of comic writers, old and new, the old including Plautus, Actius, Terence; the new "also called satyrists," Horace, Persius, Juvenal; where, of course, there is some confusion with the satyric play of the Greeks, but no more than any

dramatic meaning whatever. But if the modern legitimate drama began in the purely literary study of ancient plays, then it is a curious paradox that the first acting plays of the Renaissance were not composed by men versed in Plautus and Sophocles, and were not based on classic plots nor restricted to classic forms. They were, indeed, often based on Greek narratives; but these tales, instead of being classical or ancient, were of the very time to which the plays themselves belonged. To explain this it is necessary to consider that the occupation of Constantinople by the Ottoman power was no sudden or unexpected catastrophe. The movement of Byzantine refugees to the westward began long before the hordes of Islam crossed the Bosphorus. These earlier fugitives made no

reader might make if he were considering likeness rather than difference. As a literary achievement, what are the odds between a Theocritian idyl and a Tassonian tragi-comedy? The miscellaneous use of the words "tragedy" and "comedy" (Cloetta, *op. cit.*, p. 41) and their cognates proves nothing. If Victor Le Clerc speaks of *Tragoedia super captione regis Franciae Johannis*, meaning only a pathetic prose account of the misfortunes of King John at Poitiers, he could yet have known what the technical meaning of tragedy was. A newspaperman uses words of this kind in remotely derivative senses (as such they have been common coin since Plato's time) almost daily, and yet, if called upon, he could usually give a fair definition of each of them as restricted to the stage. In fact, an experiment upon a man who writes theatrical notices daily showed that his first thought, upon being asked the meaning of the word "tragedy," was not of the staged piece, but of some or any sorrowful occurrence or narrative, and his definition of "comedy" answered almost word for word to the group of definitions gathered by Cloetta from the whole range of mediaeval literature; and yet the man has a thorough professional knowledge of the theater, with absolutely no knowledge whatever of the authors whom Cloetta cites.

such stir in the world as those did who reached Italy just in time to gratify the slowly awakened curiosity of Italian men of letters. Nevertheless, they interested and amused the people among whom they found a home. The first modern Roman comedy was a humorous illustration of the adventures which befell expatriated Hellenes. Two brothers from Methone in the Peloponnesus, who were captured by the Turks, subsequently met in Rome without recognizing each other. Readers of either Plautus or Shakespeare would be at no loss for incidents appropriate to such a situation. Cardinal Bibbiena, who wrote this play, and Leo X who had it acted, would have thought it hardly necessary to reproduce Plautus in Italian, or to draw characters from an obscure Greek community, if the device had not harmonized with facts and feelings of the time. This play, performed at Rome in the year 1513, was the beginning of a general dramatic movement in the courts of Italian princes. Venice alone resisted and repelled the new fashion. The reason for this appears to be that the fashion was not new to the Venetians. Already years before the public representation of Cardinal Bibbiena's play, the Council of Ten found it necessary to forbid comedies, recitations, comic or tragic performances, and eclogues, as things which had come into great vogue and had proved a cause of immoderate expense as well as

of immorality among the people. These plays, it was said, were especially popular at festivals and weddings and banquets. In these particulars are to be seen all the habits of the Byzantine mimes. Among those who had cultivated these novelties in Venice was Catherine Cornaro, the deposed queen of Cyprus. Her name is manifestly a link between the short-lived Venetian drama of the latter half of the fifteenth century and the theater of the Greeks. Another link is to be found in the circumstance that the plots of such early Venetian plays as are now known were taken from contemporary Greek life and history, and that many characters in them were represented as using language that was a curious and amusing mixture of Greek and Italian.[1] The people who

[1] Sathas quotes from the *Rhodiana* of Ruzante the following passage, illustrating this curious jargon: "Elaudo (ἔλα ἰδῶ), chiá vol diri che li tundi cosi? . . . . Ah, mariuli no basta chie la fortuna sia chindes anni me ruvaersao in dosso (τόσον) tanta desgratia de perdere le mie spiti (σπίτι) la mio cansa, la mio romba, la chieraza (κυράτσα) la mio ambelia (ἀμπέλια), la mio gineca (γυναῖκα) Laguria mugieri, e Delia thicutera mu (θυγατέρα μου) fiola, la mia dulci cara morfi (εὐμόρφη) insula dela Rhondi cotandi valandhomini, e andesso chianixa ('ξάνοιξα) drizao de haveri calchun ben in chesta terra cum la mia spianza del merdegari (μερτικάρη), e vui co chielo trahituro dela Rumberto me fà chiesti cose? Stan be cuxi? cusi tutto cando xè per cason de chieli magarismeni politichi (μεγαρισμένη πολιτικὴ) e ruflagni; asene, asene."

As to the Calandra of Bibbiena, Roscoe, in his *Leo the Tenth*, Vol. I, p. 26, indicates that not so long ago it was considered the earliest of all modern comedies.

The Venetian decree shows that theatricals of some kind had been popular in Venice up to the date (1508) when it was promulgated—that is five years before Bibbiena's play was written: "Studuit semper dominium nostrum cum hoc Consilio levare de medio ea omnia quae

spoke this jargon, which was nothing like a patois, but was rather the talk of persons who eked out a meager foreign vocabulary with words from their own language, must have been numerous, since they were able to give it a considerable literature. In addition to the Greeks who had to speak it because they could make no nearer approach to Italian, there appear to have been Venetians who took pride in mastering it. An amusing contemporary poetical sketch describes a comedian of Venice who was not willing to give it up even with his life, but returned as a ghost to try it again.

Following antique terms of classification, one may say that not only these early Venetian

cognita fuerunt posse quoque modo corrumpere et depravare bonos mores juventutis et consequenter introductiva illarum molarum rerum et effectuum, quae, ut inhonesta, honeste dici et nominari non possunt. Cum igitur a paucissimo tempo citra appareat introductum in hac civitate quae ex causa festorum et nuptiarum, postuum et aliter, et tam in domibus, quam etiam in propatulo ad haec praeparato recitantur et fiunt comoediae et repraesentationes comoediarum, in quibus per personatos sive mascheratos dicuntur et utuntur multa verba et acta turpia, lasciva et inhonestissima; et cum ista quae ultra dispendium civium nostrorum plena et praevia sunt malorum, non sint permittenda procedere ulterius; capiatur: Vadit pars quod auctoritate hujus Consilii deliberatum captum et prosivum sit, quod comoediae, recitationes, et repraesentationes comoediales seu tragoediales, eglogae omnino banniantur, sic quod de caetero fieri et exercitari non possint, in hac nostra civitate tam privatim quam publice, et tam pro festis nuptialibus et postibus, quam aliter ullo modo sub poena magistris standi per annum in carcere clausos, qt tamsi per annos quinque de Venetiis et districtu in casu contrafactionis: et de praedictis poenis non possit fieri gratia, donum, vel remissio, et pars qua ponetur, non intelligatur capta, nisi habuerit omnes vallotas hujus consilii congregati ad perfectum numerum sexdecim." *Decree of the Council of Ten*, December 29, 1508. Arrigoni Renato, *Notizie et osservazioni intorno all' origine e al progresso dei teatri e delle rappresentazioni teatrali in Venezia*, 1840; quoted by Sathas.

plays, but Cardinal Bibbiena's comedy *Calandra* and the two tragedies, *Sophonisba*, the one by Gallotto, the other by Trissino, belonged to the *drama palliatum*, the essential difference being that at Venice the actors as well as the themes were Greek, while in other cities Italians assumed Greek dress and character. In the subsequent development of the Italian theater Greek subjects were as common as Italian subjects were on the English stage; and that is saying much, for Ben Jonson[1] knew the time when a play could hardly be made to go at all in London without an Italian plot and Italian characters. When it came to the only style of dramatic art that the Italian poets deemed novel and original with themselves,[2] the style to which ultimately the world owes the Shakespearian idyls, *As You Like It* and *The Tempest*, the romance *A Winter's Tale* and the satire *Love's Labour's Lost*, indebtedness to the Greeks was frankly, though only partially, acknowledged. In

[1] A list of the acted plays of the period would prove the fact.

[2] Sannazaro's *Arcadia* is one long languorous fit of what is usually described among Americans as spring fever, in which natural things seem to be painted rather than realized. It gives one the same sensations as those one has in gazing at landscape on a Dresden vase. It is wonderfully lazy reading. But perhaps Sannazaro's boast as translated by Brydges was true of his time and of Italy, as thus in his address to his pipe:

> To thee at least the grateful praise belongs,
> That thou wert first who to the woods hast brought
> The love that has the Muse to rustics taught,
> And filled sweet Echo with Pierian songs.

These lines are from a translation by Sir Edgerton Brydges.

the Venetian prohibitive decree mentioned above, eclogues held a prominent place. What the Italians, following Virgil, meant by eclogue, that the Greeks after Theocritus described as an idyl. It did not occur to Tasso and his contemporaries that this form of poetry as a public entertainment had been revived in Italy by Greek influence. What they observed was that the recovery of the works of Theocritus and the Greek novelists had given them welcome suggestions. Their literary obligation they admitted; their debt to Greek stage tradition has always been ignored. As for the moderns—none has ever touched a hand to a pastoral play or eclogue without well knowing that, directly or indirectly, he was a disciple, if not an imitator, of Sannazaro, Guarini, Tasso, and Ongaro. It is the vice of the pastoral tragi-comedy that whatever novelty may be attempted in it is limited to a fixed round of characters, and to a scanty series of incidents and situations. In any other hands than those of Shakespeare the story and characters of *As You Like It* would be too ridiculous for laughter, and in sober earnest the argument of nearly all the Italian pastoral plays is absurd. The whole affair is as monotonous as a modern novel, and yet it can, like the novel, always be made attractive to an age in the humor for it. The first poet who wrote idyls exhausted all the original possibilities except the possibility of being

followed by others. If he had thought of that, he might have written one more idyl and crowded into his Sicilian vales his successors, all telling the same story, but each in his own words. To a poet of his resources it would have been so easy to convert his little rural pictures into five-act dramas with songs and dances that we must think he intentionally refrained in the true spirit of Hellenic moderation. The Italian poets expanded the idyl into a play, just as the post-classic Syrian Hellenists had long before elaborated it as a novel in prose. The *Arcadia* of Sannazaro, the *Aminta* of Tasso, the *Pastor Fido* of Guarini, the *Alceo* of Ongaro, are links in a single chain of literary evolution. But there is even a closer relation between the *Aminta* and the *Alceo.* They are, in fact, one play viewed under two different aspects. Ongaro discovered that all he had to do to make a new drama was to give his shepherds and shepherdesses new names and new costumes, and put them to sea. The halieutic play was thus easily perfected, and the Bathed Aminta became one of those indestructible witticisms always to be duly repeated whenever the subject recurs to which they apply. This imitative method, however, was not supposed to lessen Ongaro's merit. Tasso himself translated passages in his play almost verbatim from the Greek novelists and from the idyls of Theocritus. One of the pretty passages of the

Aminta, that in which Phyllis is stung by a bee, is taken from the *Leucippe* of Achilles Tatius. From the same source was derived the lesson of love which the enamored swain teaches by the example of plants and animals—a favorite device in the Italian pastorals, and one that recurs in Shakespeare's *Venus and Adonis*. Echo songs, frequent in these plays, were no novelty in Greek after the epigram of Gaurodas in the *Anthology*. The heroes of the Italian tragi-comedy usually prepare to die by making pretty speeches, full of pathos, to the shepherds, to surrounding nature, to the sun, to the moon, and to the pitiless damsel whose cruelty has driven them to despair. This monologue invariably contains ideas and phrases that were long before used by Theocritus, Longus, and Sophocles. In short, a detailed comparison of the Italian pastoral plays with the novels of Tatius and Longus and the poems of Theocritus will reveal innumerable parallels which are not accidental.

Finally let us come to the point by another way. We have already remarked that it was the traveling English actors who gave Germans the instruction necessary to the transition from the ecclesiastical and artisan plays to the secular drama.[1] Some

[1] Pearson, *Chances of Death, etc.*, Vol. II, p. 269, alluding to the "crudeness and apparent helplessness of the earliest attempts of the secular drama in Germany," remarks that "its authors had to learn how to replace symbolism by acting, and how to build up a new con-

even maintain that Shakespeare himself was one of those who strolled through the Low Countries and Germany, perhaps going as far as Italy, about the close of the sixteenth century. The influence of these English player companies was at once acknowledged, for German playwrights began compositions in what they called the English manner. It would be rash to say that the Germans could not have taught themselves to bridge the chasm between the passion-play and—*Wallenstein*, for example. But the fact is that they were not left to their own devices.

Another illustration: This change of the religious play to the true drama had been brought about among the English in the second half of the sixteenth century. It is possible, of course, that the confessed aptitude of English talent for the drama and the stage might have brought this revolution about of itself. But the fact is that it did not, and the interference came precisely from the region whence it would rationally be expected. In the years 1577–78 an Italian comedian[1] enter-

ception of dramatic unity. It was the English actors and the English playwrights who chiefly helped them in this matter." And Furness, in his introduction to *Much Ado about Nothing* (see also *Atlantic Monthly* for July, 1899, pp. 13 ff.), reviews the English histrionic invasion of Germany, quoting among other things the statement of the old German dramatist Ayrer that he made his plays "auff di neue englische Manier und Art."

[1] Furness, as above cited: "Just as Italian companies came to London, where in 1577-78 there was an Italian commediante named Drousiano, with his players—a fact, by the way, disclosing an intimate

tained London audiences, doubtless in the same atmosphere of hot friendship and fierce enmity which has ever since enveloped Italian singers and actors on English soil.

Now if we turn to Italy and look back to the closing years of the fifteenth century, we shall find that the transition from the religious play and from the folk-performance to genuine drama had to be made there also. True, the religious plays of Italy were unlike those popular north of the Alps, but they were equally unlike that which the canons of the legitimate drama required. It is open to anyone to say that the change could have been made by the theatrical instinct of the Italians without help. But the fact is that they had the help of the Byzantine mimes, and that they did not attempt the secular drama for themselves till this help came to them.

relationship at that early day between the English and the Italian stage of which far too little account is made by those who wish to explain Shakespeare's knowledge of Italian manners and names."

LIBRARY OF THE BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

EASTERN TRADITIONS AND WESTERN DEVELOPMENT



CHAPTER III

EASTERN TRADITIONS AND WESTERN DEVELOPMENT

I

Historians of the modern drama, as a rule, discuss the theme from the point of view of national pride.[1] French critics look back to the mysteries in the Church of St. Martial at Limoges, or to that of the death of St. Catherine represented by the monks of St. Denis. English antiquaries note the play of St. Catherine at Dunstable in the twelfth century, justly observing that it was far from seeming a novelty to the contemporary annalists. There is, of course, a dispute whether this was a spoken play or mere dumb show. Aside from that, the familiar quotation from Fitzstephen shows that long before the close of the twelfth century religious dramas were common in London, as they were also in the capitals of the continent.[2] The Italians making the wide distinction that exists between the so-called sacred play and the legitimate drama might well name Mussato, about 1300, contemporary and acquaint-

[1] Sathas, *en'*.

[2] Hazlitt's Warton, *History of English Poetry*, Vol. I, p. 211; Vol. II, p. 216.

ance of Dante, as the true restorer of ancient tragedy; that is, if tragedy were, what Seneca thought it to be, a thing to be read rather than acted. More justly than the rest, the Germans can claim priority for the Terentian comedy of Roswitha, the nun of Gandersheim, who flourished about the close of the tenth century.

In this conflict of opinion, the various western nations agree only in ignoring the Byzantines, as a people who cared nothing for literature, who wasted a thousand years or more in theological disputations, in gathering up gnomic and epigrammatic trifles, and in composing pious necrologies. But Byzantine history shows that the unfortunate subjects of the Eastern Empire, though they rejected the authority of the popes, were nevertheless human beings, with the tastes and aptitudes of humanity, more polished in manners, and better furnished with the means and appliances of a cultivated existence, than the peoples of the West in the mediaeval period. It stands to reason that as long as they retained the traditions of the Hellenic past, they would seek with more or less industry and skill to prolong the intellectual activities which those traditions commemorated. The Byzantines not only preserved the theatrical habits of the Hellenic race, but also endeavored to Christianize the stage long before Roswitha was in existence. In fact, the whole history of the theater among

modern nations is only a repetition, on general lines, with variations in detail, of what had already happened in the Graeco-Roman Empire. Constantinople had its classic drama, its imitations of the classic drama, its spectacles, its theatrical sensations, its ballet, its opera (if that term may be used to describe dramatic performances that were musical throughout), its vaudeville, its plays with local and personal "gags," its smart set to write epigrams on actors and actresses, and all the other particulars of a parallel that might be drawn out to weariness. The famous comedies of Roswitha, when their genesis is carefully investigated, are seen to have with eastern lore, dramatic traditions, and history relations that can be explained in only one way.

The question as to the authenticity of the plays ascribed to her is hardly serious. Either she wrote them, or Conrad Celtes was deceived, or he wrote them himself. Even upon the last, impossible supposition they antedate all non-religious dramas in the West, except the two tragedies of Mussato and perhaps a Spanish comedy. Celtes published Roswitha's comedies in the year 1501. The Spanish tragi-comedy, though written in 1499, was practically unknown till much later. Reuchlin's scholastic interludes,[1] the first of which was per-

[1] Perizonius, *Historia saeculi sextidecimi*, p. 97: "Praeterea Monachi vexabant ubique doctos, et ad inquisitores haereticae pravitatis deferebant. Ita certe cum Joh. Capnione egerunt, viro insigni,

formed in 1498, while they undoubtedly mark the revolt of the modern spirit against the vulgar traditional mediaeval play, would hardly be called dramas from the classical point of view; still less from the modern. Reuchlin's value in dramatic history is due to his immense weight as a scholar, and to the unflagging perseverance with which he pursued every inquiry opened to him. Twenty years after the performance of his first school play, we find him writing to Bilibaldus Pirkheimer that

et hoc ipso tempore professore Ingolstadiensi, qui literas Hebraicas primus in Germania excitavit, et in Academia ista mane explicabit Davidem Kimchium, vesperi Aristophanis Plutum, auditoribus longe plus quam trecentis, ut ipse in epistola ad Bilibaldum Pirkheimerum narrat."

Lizelius, *Historia poetarum Graecorum Germaniae*, pp. 11 f.: "Nunquam ante ipsius aetatem comoedia in Germanorum scholis acta fuit; primus Reuchlinus theatrum aperuit, atque adolescentulos Heidelbergae, anno MCCCCIIC, in scenam produxit. Comoedia haec jambicis trimetris ab eo scripta Hagenoae anno MDXVI excusa, in cujus prologo Reuchlinus optimo jure se novum (addo primum) poetam adpellat, pergitque:

Optans poeta placere paucis versibus,
Sat esse adeptum gloriae arbitratus est,
Si autore se Germaniae schola luserit
Graecanicis et Rhomuleis lusibus.

Theodorus de Plennigen, Doctor et Miles auratus, poetam nostrum alloquitur [in epistola ad eum pridie Non. Feb. anno MDVIII scripta], "Tu inter Germanos nostros hodie (vera loquor) Homerus noster merito unus censendus es." Henricus Bebelius, celebris ille vates et aetate Capnionis Tubingae professor, Sapphicum decantat, hac inter alia voce:

Si cupis sanctos latices adire
Castali fontis clariive vatis
Serta daphnea emeruisse possis
Tempora circum.

Seu lubet socco aut Sophoclis cothurno
Optime certas, tenuive plectro
Pindari et Sapphus fidibus canoris
Carmina scribis.

he had more than three hundred students at his lectures, and that he was reading to them David Kimchi in Hebrew in the morning and Aristophanes' *Plutus* in Greek in the afternoon. Celtes served an equally good purpose among those who clung to the old religion. The old-time literary and educational enthusiasm died slowly in the monasteries as the universities rose in popular esteem. Monkish orders took advantage of the new system by having houses more or less intimately associated with the universities. Nothing of the kind was thought of for the women monastics. Indeed, the idea was already gaining ground, especially in Protestant countries, which has been so often exploited in more recent times, that woman's share in the world's activity consisted mainly in ignorance and good works. With the disappearance of the convents, Protestant countries were left for a time in a worse plight as to the education of women than those which kept their allegiance to the ancient church. Intellectual women in the nunneries felt this. They saw the danger, and they welcomed every tribute to the mind of woman. When Celtes published the comedies of Roswitha, Charitas Pirkheimer, sister of the Bilibaldus aforesaid, an abbess in Nuremberg, was delighted. From her cell she wrote, avowing her eternal gratitude to one who had brought such a book to light. She rejoiced when so great mental powers

were bestowed on man, that "the frail and humble sex," was not denied "some crumbs from the table of wisdom." Thus Roswitha, if her plays were never acted in her own time, performed a signal part at the revival of learning. But she cannot be excluded with certainty from the crowning happiness of the dramatist. The impression that her works were written to be acted, and that they were acted, is strong upon more than one good critic.[1] To her contemporaries she appears to have been well known in the same sense in which the phrase would be understood at the present day. She proudly called herself the mouthpiece of Gandersheim, though she held no official place in that aristocratic community. She has even been the object of patriotic effusiveness, as with that ancient author in the Leibnitz collection who called her affectionately the Saxon girl, and with the recent, better-known critical historian Ebert, who cited her fruitful poetic talent as proof that the Saxon element was destined to guide the German nation in the domain of art.

[1] Pearson, *Chances of Death, etc.*, Vol. II, p. 288: "Latin plays with Biblical and other themes—perhaps even those of Terence—appear to have been acted in the cloisters before the religious play in the church had attained any considerable degree of development. Hroswitha's anti-Terentian plays certainly suggest this, and Magnin's opinion that they were intended for acting does not seem to me so absurd as to some German critics." Contrast Winterfeld, *Hrotsvithae opera*, p. iii: "Gallicanum Saec. XII, cum drama ecclesiasticum efflоruit, scenis sollerter distinxerunt et in passionale Alderspacense receperunt. Hrotsvit ipsa de dramatis agendis cogitare non potuit. This is a pretty bad non sequitur."

This is one of those cases where a word by a contemporary annalist would have been of decisive value. But the same can be said of more than one place in the record of mediaeval experience and of Byzantine experience as well. The Byzantines, unfortunately, were not much given to the writing of memoirs; they were still less careful in the preservation of such compositions, and this indifference on their part is felt especially in the effort to reconstruct from fragments picked up here and there anything like a complete description of their public entertainments. It is certainly not true, however, that Christianity alone was responsible for the downfall of the ancient drama. The real cause of this calamity lay in the conduct of the emperors, who for political reasons supported only game and farce and dance, despising and persecuting the solemn tragedy. Curiously enough, tragedy found an asylum among the barbarians of the Caucasus and the Pyrenees. With better literary taste than that of the dominant race, the Armenians and Spaniards welcomed the Hellenic drama, and not only honored and rewarded actors of classic training, but paid them extravagant homage, declaring that they had never before heard language of such melody and sweetness. It is worth remembering that the theater of Marseilles—so long a Greek colony on the borders of Spain—continued to be celebrated many years

after the incursions of the northern savages. The influence of Rome, however, was in favor of the circus as opposed to the stage, and consequently the latter was gradually forgotten whenever Greeks ceased to visit the West. If one reads of interest in the drama among the Latins, one is sure to find near by some remark pertinent to Byzantium or to the Byzantines. Thus, in the times of the bitter persecution of the theater by the Orthodox church under the emperors Leo and Zeno, obviously all the actors who could escape from the Eastern Empire were fain to do so. It is easy, then, to see the relation of affairs in Byzantium at that moment with the effort made at Rome to revive the theater. Anthemius, the emperor of the West, ostensibly yielded to Leo as his patron and model, but secretly despised him as a barbarian and boasted his own descent from Julian, the last great defender of heathenism. While Leo persecuted the heathen and slaughtered the Arians, pressing upon Anthemius the same cruelty as a pious duty; the latter, whose empire was more than half Arian and was rapidly becoming wholly barbarian, was himself only a nominal Christian, inclined to restore the ancient religion under the guidance of the Neoplatonists. In all probability it was this secret wish that led him to befriend Byzantine actors. Among these were two famous mimes, Caramalus and Phabaton. Sidonius Apolli-

naris,[1] the Gallic poet, saw these men on the stage, and his praise of them is as extravagant as that of the ancients for Roscius. The Roman stage thus rehabilitated was far from being a permanent institution. But it was an asylum for the forces of Hellenism until such time as the battle turned in Constantinople.

The turn came with the death of Zeno. His widow, Ariadne, instead of accepting the husband chosen for her by the patriarch, married and raised to the throne Anastasius, who was even more of a Hellene, and by a much better genealogical right, than Anthemius. Anastasius, as a man of peace and cultured Hellenic tastes, despised the mimic warfare of games like those in which the Romans still delighted. He forbade the fights with wild beasts, and abolished the cordax—an indecent dance in which boys figured as women, which seems to have had its votaries from the time of the Old Comedy. But he loved the stage and willingly encouraged it, often remitting the entire tribute of cities that were unable to support the legitimate theater and at the same time pay the imperial taxes. His temper seems to have been shared by that great civilizer, Theodoric, the first Gothic king of Italy. Theodoric was the true great

[1] Apollinaris Sidonius, Carmen xxiii:

Coram Caramalus aut Phabaton
Clausis faucibus et loquente gestu,
Nutu, crure, genu, manu, rotatu
Toto in schemate vel semel latebit.

man of the people in the sixth century.[1] Equally master of the art of war and the arts of peace, he had a clear view of his purpose as a conqueror and ruler, and an exact knowledge of the means at his command. Toward Byzantium he held the politic language of a viceroy; but to his own subjects, conquerors and conquered, he spoke as a king. He took possession of the palace of Honorius, and filled it with a train of officials and servants; he clothed himself in the imperial purple; he coined money with his own image and superscription; he employed the royal plural, and bore himself always as a colleague of the emperors. He had his consuls, his prefects, his praetor, his governors of provinces. He continued the Senate as of old. In short, he was an actor of the first rank, all the more because he felt the genuineness of the part which he had assumed. The traditions of Roman administration were preserved by him with the greatest care, and he retained as officials the men who were best acquainted with all these matters. To the people he said what they had heard for centuries from the imperial throne, that his dearest wish was to assure the citizens a happy life of ease. Of course, in this assurance there was no consciousness on his part that Roman citizenship under the Roman law implied a conjoint

[1] Kurth, *Les origines de la civilisation moderne*, édition abrégée, pp. 156 f.

sovereignty and that Italian citizenship had its rights as against the Roman supremacy. He was a Teutonic king, elective perhaps, but once elected the master of all, the source of authority, of privileges, of penalties. He was impartial as between Roman and Goth, and he convinced all that he spoke truth in saying that his best-beloved subject was the one who best obeyed the laws. He gave a security to person and property long unknown. Agriculture looked up. Public works were undertaken. Ancient monuments were restored and new ones erected. Commerce began to thrive, literature brightened a little under his auspices, and he softened for a time the asperities of the contest between Arian and Catholic. Only once, and that almost in his last days, did he betray the fact that he was still a savage behind the mask of civilization. Alas for Boethius!

Knowing how important civilization was, it was natural that Theodoric should endeavor to fill the leisure of his people with something not more, but less, sanguinary than the war to which they were inured: He sought to abolish the brute combats calling them cruel and barbarous; and, professing himself a faithful imitator of the life and public policy of Anastasius, he proposed in particular to follow that policy with reference to amusements. Since Rome and Italy at that time had neither tragedians nor actors of any other kind, it

is fair to suppose that, as in the reign of Anthemius, players and musicians were secured from Constantinople to teach Theodoric's Goths and Romans the Byzantine dramatic art. This surmise is confirmed by the conduct of the Goths a few generations later—that is, in the age of Justinian. They spoke of the Byzantines in derision, asserting that they had never seen any who were not either tragedians, mimes, or pirates. Evidently the Teutonic race at that time did not derive much benefit from lessons in the Greek drama. However, it is possible that indirectly the legend of Theodoric—Dietrich of Berne—with its scenic episodes, was due to the tragedy and comedy, the stage-settings and machinery, of the theaters which he set up for a while in Italy.

The Roman people had already forgotten the signification of such words as "theater," "comedy," "tragedy," "scene," and Theodoric, in an act prepared by Cassiodorus taught his subjects the proper meaning of these expressions as a preliminary to the revival of the stage. It is not to be understood that these terms had disappeared from the Latin language, but only that they had acquired new sense remote from their original purport. In general it may be said of words transferred from the Hellenic theater and drama that the Greek preserves an etymological continuity broken in other languages. The Christian use of the word

"hypocrisy," for example, is a violent distortion of its earliest meaning. The change is seen complete in the New Testament, the writers of which knew little of the stage and, with the exception of Paul, nothing of the Greek drama. Byzantine Greek, of course, had the word in its scriptural setting, but it also retained the original meaning, besides giving it an intermediate application to conduct feigned, but in itself commendable. Thus a mediaeval Greek poet[1] wrote:

Let no one fail to bear consolation to those in mourning bereaved of wife or child. If thou hast gone to such an one and hast spoken comforting words, though they seemed hollow and unsympathetic to thee; yet be sure, to him they were as the wisdom of Pythagoras or of heaven itself; thy dissembling he accepts as if thou hadst suffered the sword-thrusts of a grief that pierces the heart. Well done, Hypocrisy, well done, thou dearest to all spectators, thy head worthy of crowns.

Nicephorus Chumnus applied the word "drama" to the sensational theft of a rich icon of the Virgin by the patriarch Niphon. As the affair was spectacular in its mystery and exposure, Nicephorus seems to have used the word legitimately in a sense as old as Plato. The word "theater," without ever losing its original significance, was

[1] Maximus Planudes, Στίχοι εἰς τοὺς ὑποκριτὰς ἠρωελεγεῖοι; Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, Vol. III, p. 404. Compare with these examples the copious collection of extracts gathered by Cloetta to illustrate the meaning given to theatrical and dramatic words in the West during the mediaeval period.

applied among the Byzantines, to a crowded church even by preachers like Chrysostom. But in mediaeval Latin the word came to mean market-place. When the emperor Otto III, in the tenth century, renewed Theodoric's attempt to domesticate an imitation of the Greek drama in the West, he found that *theatrum* had become with the Romans a general term applied to any ancient ruin the proper name of which had been forgotten.

II

It has already been pointed out how Greek influences affected Otto III; how Germany in his time, and in that of his father and grandfather, was awakened to the value of learning; and how German activity in turn stirred Italy out of the torpor of two centuries.[1] Compared with the Gothic upheaval in Europe which culminated in the reign of Theodoric, this movement of the Saxons under the Ottos, and their progenitor Henry the Fowler, was eminently orthodox. Compared with the ecclesiasticism of Charlemagne, the Saxon régime appears almost humanistic. This humanist tendency grows more perceptible with each successive sovereign, until Otto III becomes the presage of the free-thinking Hohenstaufen. Not that any of the Saxon emperors had a quarrel with the church.

[1] Sathas, *ιη'*; Ronca, *Cultura medioevale*, p. 203; Neumann, *Die Weltstellung des byzant. Reiches*, p. 36.

They were the most devout of men. But if the church had meant for Otto III what it meant for Frederick II, obstruction instead of progress, obscurity instead of enlightenment, it is plain enough in the character of the two popes, Gregory V and Sylvester II, whom he created, what his policy would have been. Consider what the fact means that under a Catholic emperor an attempt should have been made to revive the theater in the West. It was well enough for Theodoric to favor the stage. He was an adherent of what was known far and wide as the thymelic heresy. But the unshaken attitude of the Catholic church had been that exemplified in the laws of Charlemagne. If the church was less restrictive under the Saxon emperors than it had been earlier, that was because the papacy was in no condition to enforce its traditions. The age was that of John XII, of pagan superstitions without pagan learning in the Holy See, and of unwonted ignorance and disorder throughout Italy.[1] On the other hand, Germany had entered upon an era of prosperity with the accession of Henry the Fowler. Her affairs had fallen into the hands of a nation fresh and untried[2] as compared with the Franks and Burgundians.

[1] Alexander Natalis, *Historia ecclesiastica*, Vol. XI, pp. 355 ff. The persistence of these ancient Etruscan superstitions is illustrated in Leland's *Etrusco-Roman Remains*.

[2] Mutius, *De Germanorum ritibus, moribus, et omnibus gestis omnis praeteritae aetatis chronicorum*, liber xii, *ad finem*, is eloquent beyond his usual measure on this point.

Her case was not unlike that of new states and colonies well placed in modern times. A century or so earlier the now dominant race had been heathen. Their violent conversion by Charlemagne was an event almost within living memory. The grandsons of the Saxons who resisted the great Frank emperor were the most zealous of churchmen. The ruling family in particular, was devoted to the new faith. Its members proposed to make all Germany and all Europe, as far as their arms reached, a sort of greater Saxony. Saxons permeated the realm everywhere, and their rise to distinction as individuals was carefully noted in the chronicles. On the borders of the German kingdom all the way around from France, through Belgia, Denmark, Prussia to the regions devastated by the Magyars, there was just that pressure which consolidated the political and social organization within. Most of this external force, including the Danes, the Czechs, the Magyars, was heathen. A few years before it had seemed as if the Magyars were about to sweep over the whole of western Europe, effacing the nascent civilization. But Henry had driven them back from the Riade, and Otto the Great destroyed all aggressive power in them at Lechfeld.[1] Meanwhile the frontier towers which Henry built became fortified towns, and other towns, and

[1] Oman, *The Art of War in The Middle Ages*, pp. 121 ff.

religious houses almost as populous and valuable as towns, besides being fortresses, sprang into existence. Industries of every kind known to the times felt the stimulus of the general enthusiasm. Trade, foreign and domestic, increased to the point where the necessities and even the luxuries of life became cheap. With peace and plenty came a little leisure and learning. It was no unknown thing for a single clerk to be skilled in architecture and decoration, in mosaic, in the making of gold and silver vessels, in fine needlework, in writing and illumination; in fact, in all the arts necessary to create and beautify his cloister and church.[1] In this expertness there is evidence that the Saxons of the continent were the disciples of their Anglo-Saxon relatives in Britain. The latter, isolated from the anarchy of the mainland, had retained the traditions of their earliest teachers and had improved on the example of cloistral industry set them by the British monks. The manifold skill of Dunstan in useful arts is well known. Bernard, the tutor of Otto III, was like Dunstan in this regard. But a little later, when the Saxons were absorbed in the broils of the continent and had ceased to rule, this monkish

[1] Tangmarus, *Vita S. Bernwardi*, cap. vii; Leibnitz, *Scriptores Brunsvicensium*, Vol. I, p. 445. For Dunstan's expertness in the arts see Wright, *Biographia Britannica literaria*, Anglo-Saxon Period, p. 449, and Turner, *History of the Anglo-Saxons*, Vol. II, p. 152. The edition quoted is the reprint in "Baudry's European Library."

industry was quite neglected, so that Otto IV had to inquire of three monks[1] before he found one who carried a needle. The esteem felt for books in the Saxon period was almost pathetically shown by the chroniclers, who, if a cloister burned in those insecure days of wooden buildings, were sure to think of the loss of manuscripts even before that of the church plate and the sacred furniture.[2] There was a dispute as to whose right it was to officiate at the coronation of Otto I. The choice fell on the archbishop of Mayence because he was a man of learning. Of Otto I it was said that he had little education himself, but loved learning and talent in other men.[3] Thanks to his father's success in restoring the German kingdom, he was a distinguished figure in the international politics of Europe from the day of his coronation. Embassies came to him from Italy, Spain, Byzantium; and Byzantium at least sent legates to him afterward at frequent intervals, until he conceived the idea of allying his throne with that of the Eastern Empire by a marriage.[4] He was himself married twice, and in each case his choice of a wife had imperial significance. The rise of the Saxon power in Germany was marked by his marriage with

[1] Caesar of Heisterbach, *Historia memorabilia*, lib. vi, cap. 16.

[2] The chronicles show many instances.

[3] Ronca, *Cultura medioevale*, Vol. I, p. 69.

[4] Ditmarus, lib. ii, 9: "Non virginem desideratam, sed neptem suam Theophaniam vocatam."

Edith,[1] a Saxon princess of England. It is noteworthy that, as long as she lived, Otto made no effort to restore the Frank empire in Italy. We may infer that he would have been satisfied with seeing the Saxon power, represented by his own family and that of his queen, extend from the Humber to the Danube. He endeavored to satisfy Italian appeals for help by sending his son Ludolf to act in his place.[2] But Ludolf was incompetent, and Otto, very much in the spirit of the Anglo-Saxon exemplified in recent years, took up the burden which he had tried to shift to other shoulders. In Italy he married Adelaide,[3] a Burgundian princess who by right of her former husband claimed to be queen of Italy. By this marriage he not only gained a numerous party of Italian supporters, but obtained a wife practiced in the sinuous and wavering politics of the peninsula, a skilful adviser to three generations of the Saxon house. Perhaps it was she who suggested

[1] Ditmarus, lib. ii, 1: "Consortatus tunc in Domino tunc et in regno, sceptri ferorum maximus Otto, conjugem suam Editham Ethmundi regis Anglorum filiam bene timoratam, quam patre suo adhuc vivente duxerat, consecrari praecepit."

[2] Ruotgerus, *Vita Brunonis*, cap. 31; Ditmarus, lib. ii, 6; Regino, *Ad annum 959.*

[3] Or Adelheid. One chronicler (Rolewinck) calls her Dalvida. It is difficult to see a good reason for rejecting the settled modern orthography of a familiar name to chase after some mediaeval eccentricity. Odilo, *Vita S. Adelheidis:* "Haec enim ad decorem mundi, primi et maximi Ottonis, toto orbe famosissima conjunx, et ad provectum multorum, imperatorum genitrix, illa meruit benedictione potiri, quam meruisse legimus Tobiam in ejusdem patris volumine, perfrui videlicet, ut videret filios filiorum usque in tertiam generationem."

a Greek marriage for her son, Otto II. There was delay in the negotiations, very bitter to the proud, half-savage temper of the Germans, and the general impression was that the Byzantine lady who came was not the one who had been sent for.[1] Nevertheless, Theophano proved to be a good wife. She must have had a sharp tongue, for she created a party in opposition almost strong enough to prevent her son from succeeding to the throne.[2] With this exception, her conduct as woman, empress, and statesman, seems to have been marked by wisdom and prudence. A friendly annalist described her as a woman of modest faithfulness and, what he deemed rare among Byzantines, of noble conversation. Though she was never honored as a saint, like her mother-in-law, the empress Adelaide, she was considered devout in an age that was critical in the matter of piety. If a mother's talents are reflected in the aptitudes of her children, the career of Theophano's daughter, the princess Sophia,[3] is significant. This lady, much

[1] See above, p. 154, n. 4. According to Liutprandus, in his *Relatio* of his experiences as the envoy of Otto the Great, the name of the princess sought was Anna. Baronius, *Annales eccl.*, Tom. X, An. 968.

[2] Sigebert, *Chronographia, ad annum 982*: "Omnibus pro infortunio [the defeat of Otto the Second in southern Italy by Greeks and Saracens] reipublicae animo consternatis, sola imperatrix foeminea et Graeca levitale insultabat eis, quod ab exercitu suae nationis victi essent Romani, ac per hoc coepit primatibus ex osa haberi." Ditmarus gives an account of the conspiracy to prevent Otto III from taking the crown in the beginning of his fourth book. Some of the bitterness shown by the partisans of Adelaide toward Theophano crops out in Ruotgerus, cap. 5.

[3] Tangmarus, *Vita Bernwardi*, capp. 14, 35.

against her will apparently, became a nun, and then by her will an abbess. She was a woman of high spirit, imperative in demanding what was due to her rank. When she took the veil, she wished an archbishop to officiate. Later, when she built a chapel and prepared to dedicate it, she again wanted an archbishop. In short, she added a new episode to a controversy that lasted from the times of Cyprian to the Council of Trent about the rights of bishops in their own dioceses. The views of churchmen in her own time were clearly against her, and the archbishop who seconded her arrogance finally fell under the severe censure of the Holy See. Nevertheless, she had her way, inasmuch as she had her archbishop at all the religious functions in which she was the central figure, including her induction as abbess. However, she was not merely a petulant royal nun bent on interpreting her vows according to her own convenience. She was fighting a battle for the independence of her convent, and fighting on the whole more skilfully than the mitered abbots of Christendom. If she could have had the support of other abbesses, she might have won—who knows? That a woman might be legally the peer of a bishop—such would have been the result of her contention, had she been successful. She would hardly have thought of this if she had not been a lawyer as well as a princess.

Theophano's capacity for administration was demonstrated after the death of her husband. With the aid of the empress Adelaide,[1] she baffled the efforts of those who would have set aside her young son—*dat Kint*—out of hatred toward her as *the Greek*. But she was astute enough to obtain Adelaide's assistance without compromising her own authority as empress-regent. She won the Italians to her side, and she so divided the German nobility that her enemies were left in a hopeless minority. That Otto III, beginning to reign as he did at the age of twelve years, showed himself a capable ruler was due partly to the fact that she remained his adviser till her death. It is impossible not to attribute to her the preference which he displayed throughout his short life for things Byzantine.[2] When Theophano died, the boy-emperor distrusted himself without the counsel to which he had been accustomed. He did not take his Burgundian grandmother into confidence, though she was still a vigorous old woman devoted to his interests. He did not trust the men of his court for statesmanship. Instead, he looked to the woman who was most like his mother, and who doubtless

[1] Ditmarus, lib. iv, 1.

[2] Neumann, *Die Weltstellung des byzantinischen Reiches vor den Kreuzzügen*, p. 36; Ronca, *Cultura medioevale*, p. 203: "Ottone III, giovine imperatore, di sangue greco-germanico, di educazione greco-romana, desideroso di cultura classica, pieno la mente di memorie antiche, vagheggia il sogno di rinnovare la gloria d'un impero romano mondiale, etc."

had all the Greek culture and finesse which a mother could confer. The princess Sophia was a few years older than her brother. He requested that she be allowed to leave the nunnery and to remain at court for an indefinite period as his adviser. Just as people had been surprised at the fact that Theophano, with her Greek levity, proved so wise in imperial affairs; so, now, they were astonished to find in Sophia an expert at law according to the standards of the time, and a princess, as was duly chronicled, of royal sense.[1] For three years she enjoyed the freedom of a princess and a prime minister, to the great scandal of her convent, where her secular occupation was viewed merely in its aspect as a violation of her vow of obedience. She was persuaded with difficulty to return to her life as a nun, and it was doubtless then that she was assured of her election as abbess.

It is fair to infer that the characteristics which she betrayed were similar to those of her Greek

[1] Everardus, *De ecclesia Gandeshemensis*, cap. 39, vss. 1-16:

Nu is de dritte Otto gehwoldich an dem Rike,
Dat helt he ok mit eren synen vadere ghelike,
Unde de wile he noch was an junghelíken jaren,
Unde ôme ok wise ratghever dûre waren,
He en wiste, wûhe herlike dede,
Wenn dat he de Ebdissche Gherhoche bede,
Dat se syner sûster Sophien orloff gheve,
Dat se mit ôme des Rykes eyne wille pleghe;
Wente he bedorftte dike wislike rade,
Des se twar vele an ôrem harten hadde,
Beyde to Gode unde to wertliker ere.
Unde do he bad, unde ghet widet were,
Mit ôme vor se eyner Kônigynnen ghelike,
Unde halp ok ôme mit eren berichten dat rike,
So dat des alle de lûde grôt wunder nemen,
Dat noch nu so Kôniglik sin an vruwen bilde queme.

mother. When it is said that Sophia was a woman of letters according to the standard of the tenth century, we reason that Theophano was also well educated; and this conclusion is in harmony with her long residence in youth at the Byzantine court. When we are told that Otto III tried to restore the theater in Italy,[1] we imagine that he thus gratified his mother's tastes as well as his own, and that her experience may have been his guide in an affair so remote from the usual occupations of a western ruler in the so-called Dark Ages. The argument from heredity and parental influence goes somewhat farther. Theophano's mother[2] had the reputation in Byzantine history of being an intelligent, cunning, but coarse, cruel, licentious, and murderous woman. On the other hand, her father was precisely the sort of man, as so many books of biography show, to have children of capacity and even of genius. He was brilliant, but incapable — a man of pleasure rather than of affairs; and this because his education was excessive, not because it was lacking. He had been trained in the science of government by his pedantic father, Constantine VIII, until in sheer weariness he reverted to the practice of letting the state take its course, while he devoted his attention to the Hippodrome. Theophano not only had this

[1] Sathas, κ'.

[2] Gibbon, *Decline and Fall:* "A woman of base origin, masculine spirit, and flagitious manners."

devotee of the public spectacles as her father, but she grew up in the midst of the final controversy between the theater and the Orthodox church. Her great-grandfather, Romanus I, Lacapenus, to gratify the ecclesiastical party and to lighten the financial burdens of the court, abolished the festival of the Brumalia. His unpopular decree remained in force only till his death. The reaction was followed not merely by a rehabilitation of the secular literary and dramatic amusements, but, historically if not as a direct consequence, by the introduction of the wildest buffooneries of the stage into the church. It has already been remarked that this extraordinary revolution in the Orthodox church was led by Theophylact, patriarch of Constantinople, who was a son of Romanus I, a brother-in-law of Constantine VIII and an uncle of Theophano's father. Under these conditions it is certain that Theophano's youth must have been full of such theatrical experiences as Byzantium could furnish.

III

These facts seem to have much to do with the curious literary episode of Roswitha's dramas. Roswitha is expressly said to have belonged to the period of Abbess Gerberg II in the Convent of Gandersheim.[1] This Gerberg, who was a cou-

[1] Winterfeld, *Hrotsvithae opera*, p. ii: "Hrotsvit nata est 'longo tempore' post mortem Ottonis ducis Saxoniae († a. 712), sed ante Ger-

sin of Otto II, presided over the convent from 954 to 1001, when she died of old age and was succeeded by the princess Sophia, who had been in the convent as schoolgirl, novice, and nun, with the exception of the three years' absence above noted, since the year 979. Thus Roswitha and Sophia were contemporary as nuns, and the former may have long survived the date when the latter became abbess. The convent, as an asylum for princesses and noblewomen throughout the Saxon supremacy, was almost an appendix to the imperial court. It belonged in particular to the Saxons, since it had been founded and endowed by their dukes. The widow of its founder, in her childhood a Frankish maiden who may have seen Charlemagne, lived one hundred and seven

bergam abatissam suam, cuius pater Henricus Ottonis Magni frater a. 938 in matrimonium duxit Juditham filiam Arnolfi ducis Baioariorum: his exterminis profecti ad a. 935 fere deducimur. Puellam nobili sine dubio inter Saxones genere ortam in coenobio sanctimonialium Gandeshemensium instruxit Rikkardis magistra; deinde post alias Gerberg, sodalis nimirum ingenio jam tum perspici coepto, 'auctores aliquot, quos ipsa prior a sapientissimis didicit, eam admodum pie erudivit.' Deinceps Gerberg abatissa facta est; et quae discipula fuerat, carminibus componendis operam dare coepit, 'clam cunctis, ne prohibetur pro rusticitate.'" According to this outline, Gerberg could not have been born before 939. She was, then, only about sixty-two years of age when she died. If Roswitha were born as late as 938, she could still have claimed priority in age over her superior. If she had been three or four years the elder, she would hardly pretend that Gerberg had been her instructress. Gerberg became abbess while still in her teens and Roswitha began writing verses on the sly about the same time. She was undoubtedly a poet of distinction by the time Sophia entered the convent, but the latter was a princess of the imperial house and was no doubt destined to the succession as abbess from the outset.

years, the instructor in the traditions of old times to several generations of Christian women. This venerable lady finished her life at Gandersheim. Her three daughters were its earliest abbesses; during the Saxon supremacy her descendants retained a tacit right to the succession. Naturally, whatever the convent possessed that could give it distinction was sure to be celebrated. To a royal house fond of learned and literary persons, and at the same time proud of representing a new nationality at the head of the empire, was now offered a poet who was also Saxon; not that comparative rarity in the tenth century, a man who wrote verse, but, absolutely unique, a woman. In the history of the Saxon house Roswitha emerges[1] on fulfilling the command of Otto II, who desired a poem in honor of his father. This command presupposes some earlier distinction for the poet. The panegyric could hardly have been written before the death of Otto the Great, in 973, and was probably finished some years later. Meanwhile an epic history of Gandersheim would have

[1] Roswitha, *Primordia coenobii Gandeshemensis*, 574 ff.:

Oda nimis felix, nostri spes et dominatrix,
Cum decies denos septem quoque vixerat annos, etc.

Though the text may stand, it certainly looks as if the poem were a work the parts of which were completed at widely separated intervals. While a beginning was made in the lifetime of Otto the Great, the conclusion appears to be a futility of the third generation; possibly it was completed in the times of Henry the Saint, when all the jealousies of the Bavarian house had culminated in a treacherous victory over the posthumous wishes of the last Otto. Roswitha then would have been a woman still in the sixties.

sufficed for a high literary reputation according to the fashion of the times. Such a work would have been demanded of any monastic who showed exceptional skill in Latin verse. Another work due solely to the requirements of the convent was dedicated to the memory of Anastasius and Innocent, two saintly popes, the patrons of the convent church; and, in view of the theme, this poem may well be associated with the first gift to the convent from Otto II, made at the request of Theophano for the sake of the princess Sophia, who had then just entered, probably as a pupil.[1] An elegy in praise of the Virgin and an epic narrative of the resurrection were poems of a class to which most Latin versifiers of the Middle Ages contributed. Such writings would have been quite enough to secure for the poet a commission from Otto II. But Roswitha took an unusual step for her time when she turned for materials to the synaxaries of the Greek church. The life of St. Pelagius, the histories of St. Proterius, St. Blasius, and St. Dionysius, the martyrdom of St. Agnes, the conversion of St. Theophilus, were for the most part material quite fresh in her time. The Theophilus, in particular, was not only new, but was almost the first experiment, so far as the West is concerned, in an endless series dealing

[1] Bodo, *Syntagma de ecclesia Gandesiana*; Leibnitz, *Scriptores rerum Brunsvicensium*, III, 714.

with a complicated problem of religion, philosophy, and literature. The legend, whether through the efforts of Roswitha, or otherwise, was apparently well known a century or so after her day. The chronicler of Battle Abbey mentioned it in the twelfth century.[1] It probably affected the magical fiction of the later mediaeval period, and in the story of Faustus has become as immortal as literature itself.

Bodo, the historian of Gandersheim, leads us to infer that the poet took up these themes because she was expert in the Greek language; but it is equally possible that her reputation as a Hellenist came to her because she wrote these poems.[2] In either case she is witness to the fact that in her time, which was also that of the empress Theophano, German interest in certain kinds of Greek literature was remarkable. Theophano was not an infrequent visitor at Gandersheim. If she went there as often as the chroniclers

[1] *Chronicon monasterii de Bello nunc primum typis mandatum* (London, 1846), p. 154.

[2] Leibnitz, *Scriptores rerum Brunsvic.*, III, 712: "Graecae etiam linguae notitiam habuit." Of course, this could not mean classic Greek, but the spoken Greek of the period, which was probably known to the imperial family; to all the numerous group of ecclesiastics and others who had been at Constantinople on diplomatic missions; to the crowd of officials who served the German emperors in the Byzantine parts of Italy, some of which the Saxons held practically for three generations; and to the indefinite number of traders, pilgrims, and vagabonds who spent their whole lives on the roads between East and West, and were more than welcome in every monastery they visited, especially if they had news to give or a story to tell.

stated on occasions of ceremony, she probably went also at other times for the sake of her *filia carissima*, the princess Sophia. In Sophia herself Roswitha had the daily companionship of a well-educated girl, half Byzantine in blood, who had by no means put away the world from her thoughts in putting on the monastic habit.[1] At a moment when the Byzantines fancied that they reconciled the church and the theater by uniting them, Roswitha, under the eyes of an imperial family, all of Byzantine blood and predilections, turned a new page in her literary experience. She wrote a series of six comedies, a sort of Christian Terence. To understand what this means, we must remember that such a thing as a legitimate theatrical performance, or anything more varied than the declamation of Vergil's poems on the one hand, or the Herod interlude in the church service on the other, aside from the two exceptions already noted, had been unknown in western Europe for many centuries. Two hundred years were yet to pass before the ecclesiastical drama became popular anywhere outside of Byzantium. Meanwhile a woman in the secluded society of a monastery takes up a copy of Terence, reads it with such attention as to bring the blush of shame to her cheeks—she says so herself—and then

[1] That there is no mention of Sophia in Roswitha's works may be accounted for by the supposition that the latter had ceased to write by the time Sophia became an abbess.

writes plays of her own, demure, religious, not attractive to the taste of another age, but technically correct. She has never seen a stage; possibly she never saw a description of one, unless there happened to be a manuscript of Vitruvius at Gandersheim. Hence she had no experience as to the needs of an acting play. Yet competent critics agree that her dramas could be acted as they were written. Magnin insists that they were written to be acted,[1] and there is evidence that one play, *Gallicanus*, was regularly performed in the twelfth century at Alderspach. It would be the height of credulity to believe that she was actuated only by a native impulse. Rather, it must be said that she was, so far as her comedies were concerned, a direct product of the historical Byzantine theater. She knows what she does about the stage and stage business, because she is the humble friend of a great lady to whom those things were once familiar. The reason why she does not take Menander or Philistion as models instead of Terence is that the latter is easier and is accessible. Theophano could tell her instantly that Terence was barely more than a translation of Greek plays.

[1] None of the German critics will allow this. Thus Creizenach, *Geschichte des neueren Dramas*, Vol. I, p. 20, insists that publication by scenic presentation in her case is not to be thought of, and though, as already stated, Winterfeld believes that one of the dramas was played at Alderspach in later times, he will not allow that this could have happened in Roswitha's own time under her own eyes.

The first thing to be observed in the six plays of Roswitha—and, in the light of what has been said, this would be expected—is that every one of the plots belongs to the hagiography of the Greek church. It is not impossible that they should be mere paraphrases of pieces known to the religious theater of Byzantium. The first play, *Gallicanus*, is constructed as a history of the period of Constantine, and thus is a crude presage of the Latin dramas of the Jesuits as well as of an important feature of Shakespeare. But all the plays of Roswitha appeared to herself and her contemporaries as founded on fact. It was not her intention to write romances. Gallicanus, on the eve of going to war against the Goths, asks the hand of Constantine's daughter Constantia in marriage, although aware that she has taken vows of virginity. Pressed by the foe and threatened with defeat, he is summoned by St. John and St. Paul, the spiritual fathers of Constantia, to leave his evil ways. He is baptized, and after returning victorious from battle chooses a life of celibacy in preference to marriage, much to the pious joy of Constantia. Exiled by Julian the Apostate, he is finally slain as a martyr to his faith. John and Paul were secretly assassinated and buried in an unknown tomb at the instance of Julian. But they miraculously force a disclosure of the crime by afflicting the son of their

assassin with a demon. The child is restored to his senses as soon as the father confesses, and both are baptized. This periocha shows that the play covered a period of months. If Roswitha had Greek exemplars of the saintly comedies which she wrote, it is obvious that the traditional unity of time so strictly observed in the ancient Greek drama, canonized by Aristotle, and still invariable in the dramatic pieces of Byzantine authorship which have survived the ravages of time, had already been violated long before Shakespeare, and before the dawn of dramatic activity in the West. The violation of the ancient rule by Roswitha and by her models, if she had any, was due to piety, and to the fixed belief that the tales dramatized were not only historical, but sacred, and were therefore not to be modified in any respect.

With a single exception, all the other plays of Roswitha show the same license. Thus the Shakespearian indifference on this point is the result of evolution, while the French strictness is a revulsion. As before remarked, *Gallicanus* may cover a period of months. The story of *Callimachus* requires more than twenty-four hours; *Paphnutius*, five years and twenty-five days; *Sapientia*, at least forty days; *Dulcitius* alone fulfils the Aristotelian canon and, it may be added, is the only one of Roswitha's works which meets the modern conception of comedy by being comic, not to say farcical.

Even at that, it ends tragically in the death of its group of heroines. But the tragedy would not have seemed such to the religious of the tenth century, since martyrdom was viewed as a happy ending, just as a wedding is at the present day. In this play the virgins Agape, Chionia, and Hirena were secretly visited at night by the would-be seducer Dulcitius. But he had no sooner entered the house than he fell under a delusion as ridiculous as that of Lucian in Apuleius, embracing and kissing the pots and kettles; the result being that he appeared in the morning before his guards and officers with face and clothes blackened and begrimed with soot. His lieutenant Sisinnius, commanded to take vengeance on the damsels, was led a dance through forests and mountains that presages faintly the witcheries of Ariel in *The Tempest* and of Puck in *A Midsummer Night's Dream.* Agape and Chionia were burned, and Hirena was transfixed, but not before she made a triumphant speech in which she consigned her slayer to eternal torment and herself to everlasting bliss. While the plot observes the unity of time, it violates that of place, and this is noticeable on account of the brevity of the action, though less flagrant than in the other dramas.

Callimachus is revolting to modern taste on account of its theme. The hero was so deeply enamored of Drusiana, a Christian matron, that he

tormented her continually with his attentions. She prayed for death as a relief. But he even sought her in the tomb, with the aid of Fortunatus, whose name and character suggest the popular diabolism of a later age. Both were killed by the bite of a serpent. Drusiana was miraculously restored to life, and at her devout and anxious request the two sinners were reanimated. Callimachus repented and became a Christian, but Fortunatus thought the world too good with Drusiana still alive and virtuous and Callimachus reformed, and chose hell as a preferable alternative.

Abraham in the play of that name is a hermit, whose niece Maria, after twenty years of life as a nun, becomes a vagabond. He visits her in the guise of a gallant and persuades her to return to piety. She expiates her two years of freedom by twenty years of watching and prayer. In view of the disturbance there was in the convent at Gandersheim over the worldliness of the princess Sophia in returning to court after the death of her mother, one might almost suspect a political animus in this play. The motive of *Paphnutius* is practically the same, but the heroine Thais, a courtesan is a sufficiently close copy of the women of the stage who figured with cruel humiliations in the synaxaries of the Eastern church. Thais did penance for her vicious life in the narrowest of cells for five years, and twenty-five days after

receiving assurance of forgiveness she died. In both these plays the transgressions against all the unities of time, place, and action are significant.

In *Sapientia* there is a reminder of the last great Roman persecution, the one decreed by the emperor Diocletian. Sapientia, or Wisdom, who gave her name to the piece, was the mother of three daughters—Faith, Hope, and Charity—who, under her admonitions, became as excellent as herself. When they were slain and torn to pieces by the orders of the emperor, their sainted mother collected the remains and gave them due burial five miles from Rome and herself died forty days after. This is an allegory in the form of a history and might almost be called a masque.

Roswitha wrote her plays in prose. This was certainly not because she was unacquainted with Latin prosody. But there is other evidence showing that in her time and long afterward the comedies of Terence were read without any attempt at scansion and probably without a knowledge of their proper form.[1]

That there were other pieces of unknown authorship, of past or contemporary origin, which were looked upon as dramatic in Roswitha's time and even somewhat earlier, is indicated by a passage in Ruotger's life of Archbishop Bruno, younger brother of Otto the Great. This remark of Ruot-

[1] Creizenach, *loc. cit.*, p. 18.

ger was first recalled to modern attention by Peiper.[1] The jests and mimicry, says Ruotger in effect, in the comedies and tragedies of various authors, which struck others as matter of laughter and applause, were read seriously by Bruno, not for substance, but for the study of the words used. It is no stretch of credulity to suppose that not only Latin, but the vernacular, was represented in these evanescent productions. When Ludwig the Pious burned his father's collection of German popular literature, he was certainly not able to destroy at the same time the taste of either Franks or Saxons for their folklore nor their memory of what they had so lately enjoyed. But his devout insanity suggests what may have happened in many other cases—and the argument at this point could be braced by the analogy of instances from Byzantine history, and also from the history of later times in western Europe—in the period between his brief day of irrational supremacy and the later one when secular literature, in all its forms, recovered its respectability. In any event, Ruotger's statement puts the evolution of the western drama in a light not usually cast upon it. The implication is that what Peiper calls the pro-

[1] See Peiper's essay on the secular, or, as he calls it, the "profane" comedy. He cites Pertz, but those who have Leibnitz will find the passage on p. 275 of the first volume, *Scriptores rerum Brunsvicensium*, and they will be enlightened by reading the whole of Ruotger's seventh chapter.

fane comedy may have been an earlier product than the Easter play. Thus the variation and enlargement of the latter may have been an effect of secularism and only the material, not a cause, in dramatic development. A mere glance at the earliest Easter dialogues shows that they were only amplifications of Scripture, with the addition of what may properly be called stage directions. Here is, for example, the one from the Bamberg Troparion,[1] supposed to be one of the earliest:

[Ad visitandum sepulcrum presbyteri vice mulierum: Et dicebant ad invicem.] Quis revolvet nobis lapidem ab hostio monumenti? Alleluia, Alleluia.

[Interrogatio angeli.] Quem quaeritis in sepulchro, Christicole?

[Responsio.] Jhesum nazarenum crucifixum, o caelicole.

[Econtra.] Non est hic, surrexit, sicut predixerat; ite, nuntiate quia surrexit de sepulchro.

[Presbyteri.] Surrexit enim.
Te Deum laudamus.

This remained the formula, at least in a general way, of the Easter play, for many generations after Roswitha wrote, and Bruno read, far more elaborate dramatic pieces. The problem of this book is not to show how these things contributed to the evolution of the drama in the West, so much as to suggest that they are echoes of similar things in the higher, but waning culture of the East. There

[1] Lange, *Die lateinischen Osterfeiern.*

can be no question but that the liturgy of the Latin church stands in much the same relation to the earlier liturgies of the church as recognized by the State, that the English *Book of Common Prayer* occupies toward the Roman *Breviary*. It is extremely doubtful whether or not there was a complete Latin service till after Jerome.[1] For up to his time there had been no adequate translation of the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures. All those who know anything about the subject will agree that Jerome's translation of the Bible is the backbone of the Latin ritual. What is more, there is nothing in the Roman service books, except passages identical with the Greek, that are not historically later than Jerome's time. But Jerome was only a boy when the simple ritual of the early Christians, as described by Bunsen, had become a thing portentous in the liturgy of Basil the Great. As Chrysostom's liturgy followed Basil's very shortly, it may be inferred that the two marked the creative period for the church service as literature—not as folk-work—as it was also for hymnology. Doubtless the theatrical practices of the Arians had an influence. Leaders of orthodoxy were obliged to do something to keep their congregations from running away. The main point is

[1] It is impossible to be specific in an argument of this kind; the appeal is simply to the entire body of the Roman *Book of Prayer*. For Bunsen's account of the very early liturgies, see *Hippolytus*, Vol. II, pp. 47 ff., second edition.

that everything which was done at this time was done in Greek.

For reasons thus indicated it would seem to follow, when a feature is found to have been introduced into the western liturgy either in Italy, Gaul, Britain, or Germany, after having long existed in the same or a similar form in the liturgy of the East or among its excrescences, that the coincidence cannot be dismissed as accidental. But most of the books on the tropes and sequences, so called, of the West blissfully ignore the relationship of these compositions to the *troparia* and *acolythia* of the East. What the mediaeval Greek ecclesiastical community would usually have called a τροπάριον of one kind or another received among the western churches the name of *sequentia;* this Latin participial noun being an attempt to translate the Greek word ἀκολυθία, but with only a partial knowledge of its liturgic meaning. The Greek word indicated an elaborate appendix to the service; the Latin translation was applied to a carol with or without words, a sort of a musical fling at the end of the Gregorian "Alleluia" and afterward at the end of other jubilations. When Notker began to write words to these carolings, as Frere says,[1] "he still gave them the musical name of sequentia, which thus by an unfortunate confusion became a literary as well as a musical term and came to be the name for a hymn or poem—a

[1] Frere, *The Winchester Tropes, etc.*, p. ix.

trope put to the alleluia." The truth is that ἀκολυθία in Greek was a literary word, while τροπάριον was a musical term meaning the integral part of a hymn necessary to complete the εἱρμός or melodic formula, and also, in cases innumerable, a stanza complete in itself. Gautier points out that the trope as written by Notker and his companions was simply an amplification of words either scriptural or liturgical already in the service, and this can be illustrated by Tutilon's first trope:

Hodie cantandus est nobis puer quem gignebat ineffabiliter ante tempora Pater, et eundem sub tempore generavit inclyta mater.

[Interrogatio.] Quis est iste puer quem praesagus et electus symmista Dei, ad terras venturum praevidens, longe ante praenotavit sicque praedixit: *Puer natus est nobis* absque nascentium ordine procreatus de virgine sine viri semine. *Et filius datus* est *nobis*, qui nos filios sui Parentis adoptivos fecit, carnem sumens, quos et nominat fratres. *Cujus imperium super humerum ejus*, Deus quod Pater suo missus in mundum dat secundum carnem. *Et vocabitur nomen ejus*, nomen quod exstat omne super nomen, quod supernae tremunt potestates, terra et inferus quod adorant et trepidant, *magni* consilii angeliis.

[Ps.] *Cantate Domino canticum novum quia mirabilia fecit*, miro modo, cum de Virginis utero ut homo processerat et ut Deus imperitat. Gloria Patri et Filio et Spiritui sancto. *Sicut erat in principiis et nunc et semper*, et in saecula saeculorum. Amen. Alleluia! Laus tibi, Christe, qui hodie cum magna luce descendisti. Dicite, eia, Alleluia.

It is correct as Gautier points out[1] that the word τρόπος passed to Latin in the sense of "mode," that which later Greek described by the word ἦχος. Then it developed in both languages the meaning of melody, air, or tune. But he was certainly wrong in withdrawing entirely from his first opinion that it meant for the writers of sequences a change of voice, an alternation from one body of singers to another. The word itself, or its changing signification, was borrowed more than once from the Greeks, and when the application of the word "antiphon," which really describes every feature of the historic Greek service as sung, became restricted, τρόπος had to be used to define the alternation of verse singing. The *Interrogatio* and *Responsio* in Tutilon's piece show how the apparent controversy between the πρωτοψάλτης and the λαμπαδάριος in Eastern church song was understood by the Latins. Of course, the idea which Gautier says he had at first, that one choir chanted the amplification and the other the inserted words of the liturgy, was mere fantasy. But the alternation by verse or stanza is historic.

The legend of the way Notker and his associates were led to construct their sequences as a substitute for carols without words exposes unconsciously the Greek origin of the device.[2] Notker is said to

[1] Gautier, *Histoire de la poésie liturgique au moyen âge*, Vol. I, p. 53.

[2] Frere says (p. xxi): "The story is well known how after the sack of the abbey of Jumièges in Normandy in 860, a monk fled to St. Gall,

have worked under the direction of a master named Yson. If there was such a person, he must have been a Hellene or a Byzantine. But the figment is probably due to the fact that *ἴσον* was about the first word learned by anyone who attempted the study of Greek music. It was also the title of a textbook on mediaeval Greek notation. The boy choristers who sang a sort of accompaniment to the *protopsaltes* and the *lampadarius* were called *ἰσοκρατοῦντες* because they sang *ἴσον*, that is, a monotone on the principal note as a basis for all the flourishes of the leader.[1] Those who are

bringing with him his service book which contained some verses set to the sequentiae; fired by this example and reinforced by a practical sense of the difficulties involved in sequentiae without words, Notker set his literary talents to work to provide the melodies in use at St. Gall with more worthy words than Jumièges could boast of; he first tried his hand with the melody known as Organa [do not forget at this point the well-known story of Charlemagne and the Greek ecclesiastical singers] and wrote to it the words beginning *Laudes Deo concinat orbis ubique totus*, which he remodelled in accordance with suggestions made by his master Yson on the principle of a note to a syllable."

[1] Christ and Paranikas, *Anthologia Graeca carminum christianorum*, p. cxiii. This book will also furnish some examples of sacred song which will bear a comparison, so far as scriptural amplification goes, with the passage above quoted from Tutilon. The trouble with Greek hymns is that they are invariably too long to quote. Still, it may enlighten the reader to examine the intoductory troparia of the Ἀκολυθία τοῦ Μεγάλου Ἁγιασμοῦ τῶν ἁγίων Θεοφανείων, with one exception the first troparia in the acolythiae of the Εὐχολόγιον, though they relate, not to the nativity, but to the baptism of Christ. They are credited to Sophronius, a writer of the seventh century, and are as follows:

Φωνὴ Κυρίου ἐπὶ τῶν ὑδάτων βοᾷ λέγουσα· Δεῦτε λάβετε πάντες, Πνεῦμα σοφίας, Πνεῦμα συνέσεως, Πνεῦμα φόβου Θεοῦ, τοῦ ἐπιφανέντος Χριστοῦ.

Σήμερον τῶν ὑδάτων, ἁγιάζεται ἡ φύσις· καὶ ῥήγνυται ὁ Ἰορδάνης, καὶ τῶν ἰδίων ναμάτων ἐπέχει τὸ ῥεῦμα Δεσπότην ὁρῶν ῥυπτόμενον.

Ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἐν ποταμῷ, ἠλθες Χριστὲ Βασιλεῦ· καὶ δουλικὸν Βάπτισμα

familiar with Latin treatises on music of the mediaeval period will not need to be told that this Greek word took the form of *Yson.* Another confirmatory hint is the injunction of the supposititious Yson that his pupil should have a note for every syllable—a cardinal principle of Greek musical theory from start to finish. Notker sometimes disobeyed, and if he had Greek music before him he found models for his offense.

An inspection of these song-dialogues will make it clear to anyone that in a dramatic way they were slow to develop. The Latin Easter play, for example, no matter how much it was expanded, never reached the histrionic possibilities that were manifestly inherent in the works of Roswitha and presumably in the pieces that Bruno read with philological interest. That is reason enough for supposing that parallel to it the secular drama was cultivated openly or secretly in some fashion. But the church interludes all required accessories;

λαβεῖν, σπεύδεις ἀγαθέ, ὑπὸ τῶν τοῦ Προδρόμου *χειρῶν, διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἡμῶν, φιλάνθρωπε.*

Πρὸς τὴν φωνὴν τοῦ βοῶντος ἐν τῷ ἐρήμῳ. Ἑτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ Κυρίου· ἦλθες Κύριε, μορφὴν δούλου λαβών, Βάπτισμα αἰτῶν, ὁ μὴ γνοὺς ἁμαρτίαν. Εἶδόσάν σε ὕδατα, καὶ ἐφοβήθησαν· σύντρομος γέγονεν ὁ Πρόδρομος, καὶ ἐβόησε λέγων· Πῶς φωτίσει ὁ λύχνος φῶς; πῶς χειροθετήσει ὁ δοῦλος τὸν Δεσπότην; Ἁγίασον ἐμὲ καὶ τὰ ὕδατα Σωτὴρ ὁ αἴρων τοῦ κόσμου τὴν ἁμαρτίαν.

These verses are not dramatic in form, but the transition from narrative to direct address is more effectually so, and that with apparent unconsciousness, than the Latin interlocutory tropes. Besides, it must always be remembered that these songs were delivered in an antiphonal form. One could go farther and quote hymns of Romanus which are dialogic and dramatic to the limit.

they kept up a sort of school of acting and by the middle of the twelfth century they formed a "fairly complex church drama." There is, of course, this link between Roswitha's work and the service interludes, that all were the product of a piety which aimed to withdraw its votaries from profane to sacred things. As Roswitha sought to stem the tide of admiration for the delightful heathen, Terrence, so the composers of Easter plays and Herod plays, adorations of the cross, and the like, desired to satisfy the dramatic instinct with something which an archbishop like Bruno might read or hear for its matter as well as for its words.

The result was that the purveyors of religious dramatic entertainment had to become interesting in spite of themselves, even in the monasteries; and so, before the eleventh century was more than half over, Gerloh von Reichersberg was telling of certain monks who never sat down to eat together in their refectory, except on rare occasions, unless they had a Herod play on hand, or some kind of a play or spectacle like a theatrical exhibition.

IV

The influence of the works of Roswitha upon the beginnings of the drama in the West, hidden for the most part, may be inferred from the fact that the theme of the *Theophilus* was not forgotten. It had, indeed, before the time of Roswitha been

drawn from the Greek of Eutychianus into the Latin of Paulus Diaconus; but it remained for her to emphasize its value. The legend was also turned into verse by Marbode, or by some writer whose pieces were included with the works of Marbode, by Radewin; and by an anonym who made it the subject of one of the earliest French vernacular dramas, in competition with the idyl of "Robin and Marion," and the little plays of *The Pilgrim*, of *Adam*, and of *St. Nicholas*. In this French form it was called *Le miracle de Theophile*. Later the story was domesticated in English, Dutch, Swedish, Icelandic, and German. The stories of Militarius and of Antichrist, among the most important products of the mediaeval period, gave occasion for poems of a dramatic character. Gerloh of Reichersberg complained that the clergy turned the churches, houses of prayer, into theaters and filled them with the performances of the mimes. In France this dramatic activity was coincident with a powerful movement in theology and philosophy marked by the names of Berengar of Tours, Lanfranc, Anselm, and Abelard; and the last named was a leader in popular literature as well as in scholastic disputation.

But Roswitha's works never superseded those of Terence even for a moment. His comedies were sometimes performed in the seclusion of the

monasteries; read with unceasing delight; copied as much as, or more than, any other classic; quoted by all writers who made any pretense of learning even as early as Gunzo of Novara, contemporary and attendant of Otto the Great; and used as a textbook in the school of Gerbert at Rheims. Desiderius, abbot of Monte Cassino, about the middle of the eleventh century, of whom it was said that the north wind scattered not more leaves than he gathered up, built a library for his monastery and enriched it with many manuscripts, among which were conspicuous the works of Terence and Seneca.[1] A little later Albericus, of the same religious house, discussing topics of grammar and rhetoric, dwelt particularly on the authority of Terence in matters of style. But with all the study of Terence and the obvious success of Roswitha in imitating him, nothing of the same kind was subsequently attempted. The whole genius of the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth centuries, aside from the rude religious plays, seemed to run to narrative, to which the dramatic element was incidental, as in Chaucer, sometimes almost as clever and vivid as his, sometimes merely formal, and evidently intentional, decoration, labored and stiff. The beast-fables or apologues were the first to show a mastery of natural dialogue. This was not so much the result of imitation as of the belief, expressed once for all by

[1] Ronca, *Cultura medioevale*, Vol. I, pp. 69 ff., 92, 96.

Aimoin,[1] a chronicler of the tenth century, that there was a time when all animals spoke a language which men could understand, and of the effort shown in so many zoötic tales, the world over, not to translate animal cries, but to replace them with words of like sound that would make sense. Words thus put together are sure to give an unexpected model to literary artifice, and equally sure to have an idiomatic quality. That is why Du Meril says of Babrius, the great Greek fabulist,[2] that, in spite of the elegance and regularity of his verse, it nevertheless conforms to the requirements of the apologue, varying its elements so as to take easily the turns of familiar conversation. This aboriginal trait of the apologue was reflected later in the wholly human *fabliau* of the French *trouvère* and copied into the Latin of the so-called *Fables* of Adolphus.[3] Adolphus, however, though he was useful to poets after him, was himself too late to be reckoned among dramatic origins. Before his time, and long before, the actual personal contest of poet with poet—the *tenso* of Provence, the *tenzone, tenson,* or *tenzon* of other countries—became artistic.[4] That this sort of entertainment began early is evinced in the

[1] Campbell exemplifies this in his *Tales of the West Highlands.*

[2] Du Meril, *Poésies inédites du moyen âge,* p. 44.

[3] These fables can be read in Leyser, *Historia poetarum et poematum medii aevi,* beginning on p. 2007.

[4] Hueffer, *The Troubadours, passim.*

case of Salomon, a bishop of Constance[1] in the tenth century, of whom it is said that he was the first to challenge other verse-makers to trials of skill in the presence of kings. Probably these poetical tournaments were the mere continuation in a gradually changing environment of the rhetorical exhibitions of ancient times which were certainly still known in the West as late as the sixth century and had never been given up at Constantinople. They presupposed a brilliant scene, in which figured high-bred men and women in the richest fabrics and choicest fashions of the times, lively dialogue in the best attainable verse, and a dénouement in the way of prize-giving in which every artifice of culture and courtesy was displayed, and the vanity of success or the bitterness of defeat covered by elaborate ceremony. Such performances easily suggested feigned dis-

[1] The same Salomon of whom Gautier, *Histoire de la poésie liturgique au moyen âge*, Vol. I, p. 45, relates the following story: "C'est le jour des Innocents: les élèves des écoles monastiques sont ce-jour-là hors la loi, exleges; ils ont le droit de s'emparer de la personne des 'hôtes' jusqu'à ce qu'ils se rachetent. Or, c'est l'abbé lui-même qui, par un singulier hasard, tombe le premier entre les mains de ces tyrans d'un jour. L'abbé s'appelle Salomon; c'est un grand personnage et qui est en même temps évêque de Constance. Tant de dignités n'arrêtent point nos écoliers; ils le font prisonnier; 'Ce n'est pas l'abbé, s'écrient-ils, c'est l'évêque, c'est l'hôte que nous prenons,' et de vive force, ils le poussent, ils le juchent dans la chaire du professeur. Mais ici la scène change; Salomon enfle soudain la voix et leur dit: 'Voilà qui est bien; je suis votre maître, et c'est moi qui vais vous infliger un juste châtiment, si vous ne vous rachetez pas.' Ils baissent la tête et s'apprêtent à recevoir le fouet, mais essayent du moins de se racheter en composant de mechants vers qui font rire et disarment l'évêque-abbé.

putes, as in the case of Gaucelm Faidit, who wrote a sort of satirical drama, called *The Heresy of the Fathers*, to express his contempt for the council which anathematized the Albigenses.[1]

From these disputing troubadours there was an unbroken line of rhetoricians down to modern times. The rich, showy clubs of orators, actors, and poets in the Dutch and Flemish cities of the sixteenth century, described by Isaac Pontanus[2] as men of agreeable, poetic spirit who in the vernacular language, and in either prose or verse, exhibited comedies, tragedies, and dumb-shows, reciting deeds of men of old to delighted crowds, were descended from the colleges of Spanish *trovadores*, the first of which was organized by two Provençal troubadours from Toulouse, under the patronage of Don Juan, first King of Arragon. The usual prize at Barcelona was a crown of gold, in return for which the victorious poet was bound to give a banquet. As happened afterward with the inception banquet at the universities, the wealthier the candidate, the costlier the dinner. Doubtless many a *trovadore* won the crown by the bountiful table he was ready to provide rather than by the merits of his verse. These particulars may also be pertinent to the account of the honors annually conferred upon the Italian historian and

[1] Hazlitt, *Warton's History of English Poetry*, Vol II, p. 45.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 113.

dramatist Mussato by the University of Padua.[1]

Meanwhile the twelfth century, and perhaps the last quarter of the eleventh, witnessed the evolution of secular comedy on lines later perfected by Chaucer—the dramatic recitation in either prose or verse, in which the various characters were quoted as speaking *in propria persona.* An explanation of the method of representation may be suggested in another place; at present it is worth while to consider those items which are foremost in the list. The *Snow Boy* (*Schneekind*)[2] is certainly one of the earliest, as may be inferred from the variety of forms in which it occurs, as well as from its connection with very ancient Teutonic customs and folklore. Its catastrophe is a reminder of the fact that the Saxons on the continent from prehistoric times, those in Britain from the date of invasion, and the Franks as well down to the tenth or eleventh century, were only too willing to sell their children into slavery.[3] The first universal uprising of the European public

[1] Vossius, *De historicis Latinis*, p. 793.

[2] Ulrich, *Proben der lateinischen Novelistik des Mittelalters*, pp. 1 f.; Du Meril, *Poésies inédites du moyen âge*, pp. 418 f., where the verses receive the title *De viro et uxore Moecha;* Ebert, *Ueberlieferungen zur Geschichte und Literatur*, Vol. I, p. 80, traces the first version of the story to the tenth century; Leyser, *Historia poetarum et poematum medii aevi*, pp. 901, 903.

[3] Turner, *History of the Anglo-Saxons*, Vol. III, pp. 53 f.; Gibbon, *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, chap. xxxviii, rubric "Personal Servitude;" Ashley, *English Economic History* (*The Middle Ages*), p. 70.

against this thing was an outcome of the so-called "Children's Crusade," when thousands of the youth of Christendom were enticed to the Mediterranean coast, and many of them deported and sold in Africa.[1] The Anglo-Saxon law, as long as it remained in force—that is, until the Norman supremacy was established—permitted the sale of a child, at the will of the father, until it reached the age of seven years. It may be inferred that the *Snow Boy* is one of those tales which in a new age reflect, and at the same time criticize, the customs of the past. Shakespeare's *Hamlet* is one of the most elaborate of these post-secular censures, for in it the natural tribal marriage customs of one age presuppose a tragic outcome under a different social system; just as with the *Schneekind*, the sale of the boy into slavery in the tropics, which would have required no apology in the ninth century, has to be explained in the eleventh as a bitter jest on an unfaithful wife.

Then there are pieces which hark back more or less directly to the works of Plautus, and these are in a sense the most interesting product of the whole mediaeval period. That which is now called *Querolus* from the name of one of the characters, but formerly *Aulularia*, as though a part supplementary of the original play of that name,

[1] Jourdain, in his letter to Michaud on this subject, cites Alberic, Thomas of Champré, and Roger Bacon (Michaud, *History of the Crusades* [Engl. transl.], p. 445).

was long supposed to be a genuine work of Plautus, though it belongs to a wholly different kind of verse. One reason for the error was that it was read as prose, as Plautus himself was. It was restored to its proper metrical form about three-quarters of a century ago.[1] The centuries which took Horace and Ovid for writers of comedy were incapable of appreciating the full meaning of Plautus, even if they had him in hand. In some future age of ignorance the paraphrases of Shakespeare may replace the original, and may then be rewritten in a new poetical form. Present tendencies are not such as seem favorable to the continuance of Elizabethan dramatic traditions. What may happen to one of Shakespeare's plays, if it be replaced by one of the prose recitals of Charles Lamb and his sister Mary, or, worse, by one of the grotesque retellings which have recently come into fashion, is what happened to the genuine *Aulularia* by way of the *Querolus*. The Plautine original tells how Euclio, an aged miser, finds buried in his homestead a pot full of coins, which he at once buries in another spot, in his extreme caution, half dead with fear, and crazed with the thought that he may lose his treasure. Meanwhile Lyconides, son of Antimachus and Eunomia, tempts or forces Euclio's daughter Phaedria to an act the

[1] By Klinkhamer, whose work was published at Amsterdam. See also Peiper, *Aululariа sive Querolus Theodosiani aevi comoedia.*

consequences of which can be remedied only by marriage. But Megadorus, the maternal uncle of Lyconides, needs a wife, and his sister Eunomia persuades him to sue for Phaedria. Euclio hesitates. He dreads lest a crowd of guests shall find his secret hoard. As a precaution he hides his money, now in one place now in another, never satisfied with any. He thus betrays the cause of his anxiety to the watchful eyes of Strobilus, personal servant of Lyconides. It is easy to hide the gold in a new place. Then Lyconides prevails on his uncle Megadorus to give up the girl, and brings Euclio to terms by restoring to him that which he values so much higher. In the mediaeval poem Euclio is supposed, after all the incidents just narrated, to have traveled into a far country, leaving the pot or casket containing his gold buried in the court or *atrium* or *aula* of his house. But he falls ill, and at the point of death pledges his servant to return home and to disclose to his son Querolus the hidden wealth. He assures the slave of an ample share for performing this duty; but the latter covets the whole. He satisfies his conscience as to his oath by telling Querolus that the treasure exists, and then offers to seek it with the aid of magic, in which he pretends to be a past master. But as the pot, when it is found, appears to be full of anything but the desired coins, he flings it in a rage through a window. It breaks at the

feet of Querolus, and thus the youth comes into his own.

The name of the slave, Sardana, is the most suggestive feature of the poem when it comes to tracing the line by which the tale reached the mediaeval author, whether Vitalis Blesen[s]is, or another. A quatrain which accompanies the poem in the manuscripts, and has been so often published that it need not be repeated, claims the *Querolus*, as well as the comedy next to be mentioned, *Geta* (or *Amphitryon*), for Vitalis. But the identity of this Vitalis is still in doubt. Peiper is certain that he has found him in the person of a mime of this name who wrote an epitaph upon himself.[1] As the manuscript from which Peiper exhumed this little poem belonged to the ninth century, he argued that the comedies must also be of that early age. Thus these may be among the very pieces which Archbishop Bruno read. But the latest edition of Forcellini's *Lexicon* still insists, as of old, on the uncertain authorship of *Querolus*, and there are intrinsic objections to a date earlier for *Geta* than the dawn of the university period. Though the poet, whoever he was, described his work as if he actually had Plautus before him, it

[1] Peiper, "Die profane Komoedie des Mittelalters," in *Archiv für Litteraturgeschichte*, Vol. V, pp. 493-542; Cloetta, *Komödie und Tragödie im Mittelalter*, p. 73. Cloetta and Müllenbach, remarks Professor Manly, regard the fourth-century *Querolus* as having suggested the *Aulularia* of Vitalis.

is evident that he had not, and the name "Sardana" is one of the proofs. It is well known that the names of slaves in ancient comedy, both Greek and Latin, were most frequently local or racial. "Sardana" is a place name, somewhat modified, as was usual even in ancient times, and means "a native of Sardinia,"[1] or possibly of Sardis in Asia Minor, though there is a manifest etymological objection to the latter. The name does not occur in Latin comedy, for the reason that Rome did not get slaves from Sardinia, but from the North and from Greece; neither did mediaeval Europe, for it had a superfluous number at home. But Byzantium was indiscriminate. There is no such name in Ovid, a poet whom the author of *Querolus* most likely knew at first hand; but it is closely analogous in form to names frequently used for slaves, and for those who were considered no better than slaves—to wit, actors—in Constantinople and other great towns of the Eastern Empire.

In the case of the other famous poem attributed to the same Vitalis, there appears to be some evidence of descent from a late drama of the imperial period known to Sedulius,[2] author of *Carmen paschale.* Almost the only indisputable fact in the life of Sedulius is that he lived a long

[1] Greek Σαρδώ.

[2] Creizenach, *Geschichte des neueren Dramas.* But see Cloetta, *Komödie und Tragödie im Mittelalter*, p. 70 (Manly).

time in the East about the beginning of the fifth century, and that he there wrote his poem and dedicated it to his intimate friend and instructor in Christian doctrine, Bishop Macedonius.[1] In going to the East, Sedulius merely followed in the wake of thousands of well-to-do, educated people who had been induced to leave Rome for the new capital by Constantine and his family in the fourth and fifth centuries. Not only did Constantine take the people of means and culture; he took almost everything movable that would serve to make them content with their change of residence. As Sedulius was familiar with profane literature, he naturally began his ode with an allusion. If the heathen, he wrote, whether in the swelling words of tragedy or in the laughable figure of Geta, treated of the shameful reminiscence of antiquity, he could with better right sing the deeds of Christ. The cult and the fables of heathenism were as naught to him, now that the manifestation of Christ had brought truth into the world. The reference to the name "Geta" may be made only by way of characterizing comedy in general, since it was one of the names for slaves in the *Truculentus* of Plautus and in several dramas of Terence. But there is at least plausibility in the conjecture that Sedulius may have had in mind a play with this title corresponding to the

[1] Manitius, *Geschichte der christlichlateinischen Poesie*, pp. 303 ff.

mediaeval *Geta*, the principal humorous factor being the philosophizing servitor Geta. The conjecture is the more credible in view of the way Jupiter's amours figured in Christian polemics. If this play was not the Plautine original, but a paraphrase, it was most likely an eastern work, though not necessarily, in Constantinian times in Greek.

The argument against the existence of any intermediate play at so early a date is that Geta's dialectic belongs to an age of more attenuated hair-splitting logic and of less literature than Sedulius could have known, that is, to the age of John of Damascus in the East, or that of the subsequent and consequent rise of scholasticism in the West. Geta dwells on the question of his personal identity—whether he is something or nothing; on the necessity of his having a name in order to be, after a fashion of which even the Neoplatonists could hardly have dreamed. It is possible that in the ninth century a book like that of Fredegisus, *De nihilo et tenebris*,[1] proving that nothing is something, might at once have awakened the ridicule of a clever satirist. But Geta mixes this up with the realism implied in a name, and must therefore belong to a later period, namely, the one when the triangular conflict of Anselm's

[1] Fabricius, *Bibl. Lat.*, Vol. II, p. 607: "Quo probare contendit nihilum et tenebras esse aliquid."

realism, Roscellin's nominalism, and Abelard's conceptualism became not only acute, but popular to an extent that no philosophical controversy ever was in any other age. A quarrel which has left its traces in the *Melodies of Mother Goose* must have penetrated all humanity. But the soliloquy of the little old woman,

> If I be I,
> My little dog will know me,

whimsically states the problem which makes all the fun in the elaborate poem of Vitalis. The whole controversy, whether seriously or comically treated, illustrates the fact that the senses were a subordinate factor in mediaeval thought. Geta cannot trust his immediate self-consciousness. He feeds on second intentions, to use Rabelais' phrase. Not the impression of his name in familiar tones on his outer ear, but the echo within, proves to him that he is real.

The story, instead of being supplementary to Plautus' *Amphitryo*, as *Querolus* to *Aulularia*, is a parody upon its original. In Plautus Amphitryon is a hero of the mythical period at war with the Teleboans. In his absence Jupiter, taking his form and features, supplies his place with his wife Alcmena. The deceit is perfected by Mercury, who exactly counterfeits the appearance of Amphitryon's servant Sosia. When the real Amphitryon returns home, he becomes suspicious

that a trick has been played upon him, and his wife is in despair until Jupiter discloses his part in the game, to the accompaniment of thunder-claps after the manner usually affected by the ancient poets. Thus Plautus is seen to have been faithful to the general outlines of the old Greek myth. But in the mediaeval version[1] Amphitryon is represented as a student who is returning from the schools of Athens. His slave Geta, who accompanies him, has absorbed a great many pedantic notions, being in fact quite carried away with the idea that he is a first-rate logician. Jupiter, whose companion this time is called Arcas, takes advantage of the day when Alcmena, all impatience, awaits her husband's arrival. The poet does not forget this psycho-sexual point of view. He was evidently an expert. Geta, sent home from the port in advance, has his wits all disordered by finding his double there guarding a house locked against all comers. It is then that he indulges in all the vagaries of all the schools as to his own oneness, allness, nothingness, somethingness, reality, and incertitude. Not till he hears the voice of Amphitryon calling him does he come to himself. Then he beseeches Amphitryon to arm himself against the enemies who have taken possession of his house. Thus, when

[1] Wright, *Early Mysteries and Other Latin Poems of the Twelfth Century*, pp. 76-87. It did not seem necessary in a mere abstract to adopt the orthographic vagaries of either the classic or the mediaeval poet.

Amphitryon meets his wife, he is in warlike guise, whereas her impression is that he has just left her a moment since in the most peaceful and loving way. Wonder, recrimination, anger, tears, follow one another in quick succession. There is no way to explain the mystery, for she was with Amphitryon's counterpart, and Geta knows that it was his other self which kept the door. All come to the conclusion that Alcmena dreamed her part of the delusion, and that Geta was crazy. He acquiesces, only too happy to find that he still exists, and that he can answer to a name which he feared had lost him and picked up somewhat else in his place.

While the names in the poem, with one exception, are familiar to Roman comedy, if not all in *Amphitryo*, yet the conversion of the putative father of Hercules from a warrior into a student of law is disconcerting. It is still more surprising, if the work is of western origin, that this student should be a married man; and strangest of all that he should be sent to Athens to study. Athens had ceased to be a city of schools hundreds of years before this piece could have been written in its existing form, and an earlier Latin author would probably not have considered it necessary to specify any locality. But to one of the beggar-literati[1] of Byzantium it might have seemed a

[1] This is a Germanism, Neumann's *Bettelliteraten*, but graphically descriptive of conditions.

clever stroke of wit and learning to put Amphitryon in his own class, and he would know that Athens was the most ancient seat of philosophical study in Greek history, with the exception of certain Asiatic cities that were out of the question for him. The name "Geta" would have appealed to him, not merely because of its association with the classic drama, but because it identified a clown with the foes most hated in the East, the Goths. The name of the lazy denizen of the kitchen who also figures as a clown in the story, Birrhia, occurs in Terence's *Andria*. It is equivalent to the Pyrrhias of the Greeks and may be compared with the plebeian Latin "Birrhus" as used for the Greek "Pyrrhus." It is noteworthy that the play of Menander which Terence transformed into his *Andria* contained no Birrhia,[1] and Terence's Birrhia was a valet, not a scullion. Thus the Latin comedy furnishes no model for the character of Birrhia as seen in the mediaeval comedy of *Geta*. But the Pyrrhias of the Greeks dwelt habitually among the pots and pans, and his aspect was so familiar that Lucian twice used the name as a general term for persons at the very bottom of the social scale.[2] While the character could not have

[1] Valpy's reprint of the Delphin classics ("The Regent's Classics"), *Terence*, Vol. III, p. 1076, n. 1, where Donatus is quoted.

[2] Lucian, *Menippus:* Ἠπόρουν πρὸς ἐμαυτόν, ᾧτινι διακρίναιμι τὸν Θερσίτην ἀπὸ τοῦ καλοῦ Νιρέως, ἢ τὸν μεγαίτην Ἶρον ἀπὸ τοῦ Φαιάκων βασιλέως, ἢ Πυῤῥίαν τὸν μάγειρον ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος. *Timon:* Ἀντὶ τοῦ τέως Πυῤῥίου ἢ Δρόμονος ἢ Τιβίου, Μεγακλῆς ἢ Μεγάβυζος ἢ Πρώταρχος—"servile names

been borrowed from a Latin source, it might have been elaborated from Lucian's cook or scullion, or copied from those Greek plays which Lucian had in mind. A Byzantine writer of almost any period would have been capable of this kind of accuracy; but a mediaeval Latin author could never have thought of it without a Greek model, or the Latin copy of a Greek model, to guide him.

The name "Arcas" is unknown to Plautus, and also to Terence. It is taken usually, and somewhat carelessly, on the authority of Ovid and Lucan, to be an equivalent for Hermes or Mercury. But the identification is by no means complete. *Nomen est numen*, and two *nomina* cannot be one *numen* without a process of sophistication. Besides, Arcas has a legend of his own. According to Servius, he was the son of Jupiter by Callisto, a nymph in the train of Diana, whom the god deceived by taking the guise of her mistress. Hyginus is of the same opinion. But to the scholiast on the *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius[1] Arcas was the same as Endymion, and both names certainly belonged to Arcadia. The name "Arcas" is so obviously an effort to give

against those of nobles," says Tanaquil Faber. There is no way to give the proper references, as the only copy of Lucian at hand has neither paragraphs nor section numbers.

[1] Ovid, *Metamorph.*, i, 218; viii, 391; Lucan, *Pharsalia*, iv, 661; Maswich, *Virgilius:* Notes of Servius to *Ecl.* x, 27; *Georg.* i, 67; *Aen.* i, 748; Hyginus, *Fable* ccxiv; Shaw, *Apollonii Rhodii Argonautica*, iv, 264; Vol. II, p. 85.

the prehistoric Arcadians an ancestor that all other fictions must be considered derivative. It would seem as if the name were chosen by the author of Geta to fix in a general way the scene of the action. And this device also seems to point to a Greek intermediary between Plautus and his mediaeval imitator.

No matter in what way the question of date and authorship is settled, it appears to be certain that the poem began to be read, and widely read, in the first half of the twelfth century, as appears from the allusions of various authors of that age. A guess is possible as to its influence upon a group of writers destined to wide and long-continued renown, the creators of the Arthur legends, beginning with Geoffrey of Monmouth before 1135. The story of the way Igerna[1] was deceived by the transformation of Uther Pendragon into the likeness of her husband Gorlois is almost the exact counterpart of the wily Jupiter's conquest of Alcmena, the result in the one case being the birth of Hercules, in the other of the not less wonderful Arthur. But the main objection to Peiper's theory will always be the fine-spun speculations of Geta himself.

Noteworthy is it that all the Latin dramatic pieces—not only those which have been mentioned,

[1] Giles, *Six Old English Chronicles*, pp. 224 ff. The original Latin of Geoffrey is not at hand.

but the rest which can for any reason be included with them—belong to a single generation, or at most to two generations, in the twelfth century. Even if Peiper be right in putting the origin of *Querolus* and *Geta* back to the ninth century, he would be the first to admit that they were unknown to lettered men until near the middle of the twelfth. To the twelfth or the early part of the thirteenth belong all the rest of the Latin pieces that have been mentioned or that will be. One of these is a so-called comedy,[1] the persons of which are Baucis, Glycerium, Thraso, Davus, and Birria. It is of Italian or French authorship, and the names suggest a growing acquaintance with the classic Latin comedy. The form Glysceria suggests a revolt against the Latin and Greek custom of giving names in the neuter gender to women. The action of the piece begins and ends in the country, but lies for the most part in Paris. Thus it anticipates after a fashion the habitual formula of the modern American rural play, the model of which is *The Old Homestead* of Denman Thompson. There is another play, under the name of *Pamphilus*, in which figure, besides the bearer of the title rôle, a young woman of wealth and social position, called Galathea, with whom, of course, Pamphilus is in love, and Anus, that is "Old Woman," who is some-

[1] Cloetta, *Beiträge zur Litteraturgeschichte*, Vol. I, pp. 74, 83 f., 88 ff., 93 f.

thing like the female marriage-broker of the Levant. The piece begins with a prayer of Pamphilus and a response by Venus in the form of a prologue forecasting the incidents that follow. The introduction of a god or goddess in this fashion remained an inseparable device to the last of all the plays belonging to what Sathas calls the Cretan theater, and though these are confessedly an echo of the early Italian drama, yet they may in this respect preserve a Byzantine tradition. Thus the prologue to *Zeno* is spoken by Ares; that of *Stathēs*, a comedy, by Erōtus, that is Eros; that of *Gyparis*, by the "goddess of Comedy" and by Zeus; and that of *Erophile*, by Charos, that is Charōn. In a Greek version of Tasso's *Aminta* published in Venice in 1745 the prologue is elaborated by Aphrodite and Eros together.

Then there is a dramatization of the folk-tale of the *Three Dreams*, the characters being two priests and a rustic. The peculiarity of the piece is that the dreams of heaven and hell related by the priests follow the lines of the Greek Necyomancy. An elaborate poem, "Paulinus and Polla," of Italian authorship, in which narrative alternates with dialogue, can be read in Du Meril's *Poésies inédites du moyen âge*. It violates all the unities.

Finally comes *Babio*,[1] about the opening of the thirteenth century, to show that, while retaining the Ovidian elegiacs of earlier pieces, one poet

[1] Wright, *Early Mysteries, etc.*, pp. 65–75.

at least has learned how to suppress his own personality altogether and let his characters tell their own story in unbroken dialogue. The names of the speakers—Babio, Fodius, Viola, Croceus, and Pecula—are noted in the margin, with occasional remarks that resemble stage directions. It furnishes proof of the English turn for real drama as opposed to mimetic recitation. There can be no doubt of its English origin, since Babio, a secular priest, is represented as a married man, and his wife Pecula, though shamelessly unfaithful, is nothing like the one-eyed housekeeper familiar to the reader of the pranks of Howleglasse or Eulenspiegel. The moral purport of the play is, in fact, the argument which it implies in favor of clerical celibacy. Babio is aware of the unholy relations between his wife and his servant Fodius, but tolerates them for a time because he is himself madly in love with his stepdaughter, Viola. The girl, however, wisely prefers the legitimate and honorable proffers of Croceus, lord of the manor. Baffled in all his vain wishes, and at last locked out of his own house by that precious pair, his wife and servant, Babio declares his intention of becoming a monk. "I weep," exclaims Pecula, "but my tears are tears of joy. If he comes not till I ask him, he will never return." And Babio flings back: "I give Pecula to you, Fodius; don't marry her or my fate will be yours."

V

Of the merely formal method of relieving a narrative by an interposed dialogue an early specimen is the so-called "Altercation" between the towns of Mantua and Canossa in the poem of Donnizo[1] dedicated to the duchess Matilda. Donnizo was a priest in the retinue of that princess and appears to have written by authority, as an early manuscript of his work contains a picture of him in the habit of a chaplain presenting his composition to the lady, who is seated on her throne as duchess of Canossa. The poem was written within the period from the year 1100 to 1115. Its whole plan is dramatic rather than epic. In the first place, there is a prologue which the poet speaks in his own person, as he does also the first chapter of the history, in which he says that, if Plato and Vergil were alive, they could find a fitting theme for their eloquence in the innumerable glories of the dukes of Canossa. Then, as mourning the end of this line of princes, he introduces the city of Canossa to relate their names and deeds. She tells who the dukes were, who first raised her walls, by what foes she was attacked, and by what memorable achievements she was delivered from servitude. She glories particularly in the affection which Duke Atto had for her, and tells how he obtained for her the relics of the martyrs Victor

[1] Leibnitz, *Scriptores rerum Brunsvicensium*, I, pp. 643 ff.

and Corona, and of the bishop and confessor St. Apollonius. Then follows the history in chapters, missing nothing of honor to the fortress, not even the fact that there were fostered the studies of the great musician Guido of Arezzo; and finally the aim of the whole work is disclosed in the assertion of Canossa's freedom from the oversight of the neighboring bishop of Mantua. Here Mantua interrupts the discourse to express her unbounded astonishment at the arrogance of her neighbor. Canossa replies that she reverences Reginus—then the bishop of Mantua—but merely as a friend. Her own law, confirmed by the charter of Pope Benedict, excommunicates all who do her wrong.

"Pardon me," insists Mantua, "your pride is high. It touches heaven."

"Then," replies Canossa, evidently meaning to stir her adversary's temper, "sing with me the praises of our lord Boniface."

Mantua evades the challenge by taking refuge in her former literary renown. "What is it you are saying?" she exclaims. "I have done much in verse without your aid. Know you not? I am the very gate of poetry, for I gave birth to Vergil."

Canossa responds sharply that this fact is no occasion for boasting, since Mantua knows well how shamelessly she treated her great poet. Mantua, abashed by this rebuke, answers with becoming

humility, and leaves Canossa to finish her narrative in peace.

The next piece to be considered displays personification and dialogue without any setting of narrative. There is dramatic quality in rapid scholastic disputation, where those who take part are expert in the knowledge of logic and in the art of dialectic. This explains in part the vast interest taken at the outset in the barren controversies of Nominalism and Realism, which absorbed the activities of a poet like Abelard, a statesman like Okham, a social reformer like Wicliffe, and a mystical dreamer like Duns Scotus, as well as of the hundreds who followed their lectures as if listening to a thrilling romance. Dialectic had still the charm of novelty in Italy at the beginning of the thirteenth century, or it would never have been used to give form to a poem, as it was in the so-called *Disputation between Rome and the Pope regarding the Deposition of the Emperor Otto the Fourth*.[1] This Otto was a descendant of the duchess Matilda already mentioned. When Innocent III could not prevail on Otto to give up the territories which Matilda had bequeathed to the Holy See, he excommunicated him and sought to transfer the allegiance of his subjects to Frederick II, king of Sicily. Otto's immediate predecessors had been as inflexible as he in resisting the mort-

[1] Leibnitz, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 525 ff.

main of Matilda, and the high-handed act of the pope displeased even his partisans, seeing that Otto was a Guelf, a hereditary friend of the papacy. According to Cesar of Heisterbach, Innocent was generally blamed for the schism which rent the church on account of the war between Otto and Philip Augustus. Once, when the Pope was preaching at Rome, a friend of Otto named Capatius cried out: "Thy words are the words of God, but thy deeds are the devil's." It is said that a certain abbot of the Cistercians near Perugia at the time of Innocent's death saw him in a vision fleeing before a dragon which pursued him breathing flames, and invoking against him the divine justice.[1] It appears from the poem in hand that Otto was accused of calling bishops priests and abbots monks; properly enough, says the poet, though the words were used against him as though he meant to deprive bishops and abbots of their rank, and thus to make a pretext for seizing their superfluous wealth, particularly by the partisans of Philip Augustus among whom the most distinguished was the poet William of Brittany. But as soon as ill-feeling was allayed, good churchmen conceded Otto's piety, courage, generosity, and self-control. His pious death was celebrated by various writers, and exploited according to the

[1] Leibnitz, *op. cit.*, II, p. 48, Introd. Struvius, *Pistorii scriptores rerum Germanicarum*, I, p. 1098, an. 1215.

temper of the times with reports of miracles; while Innocent was discredited after his death as one who barely escaped from the fiend. The whole of the so-called *Disputation* is in dialogue, its mythology is rather pagan than Christian, and it is marked by great freedom of speech. There is no prologue nor epilogue.

ROME. Saint Peter, thy Rome lays before thee a complaint. When thou sleepest, the stupor of vice oppresses all. Treachery reigns, deceit prevails and conspiracy encircles with its blandishments those whom afterwards it deprives of light. The divine law perishes and the whole machine of the world totters. On the other hand, when thou art awake, all things wake with thee, treachery dies, deceit is driven forth, the divine law flourishes and the whole machine moves steadily. That by thee, therefore, justice may defeat treachery; truth, falsehood; the dove, the fox; be thou not moved by Otto, nor by the Apulian boy;[1] let the common need of the world and the just petition of Rome be thy motive.

POPE. Rome, head of the world, city above all other cities, as the cedar excels the hyssop, the plane-tree the tamarisk, the fat olive the barren willows; city abounding in goods, city best-beloved, what ails thee? What violence has been done to thee? Why dost thou complain? Thine outward look betokens inward grief. Thou hast never suffered a repulse when thy petition was just, the gods have sworn it by the invisible lake.[2]

ROME. God forbid, Holy Father, that our complaint turn thee from what is just. For thou, since thou art not only skilled in the decrees, but art author of them;

[1] Frederick. [2] This is a startling bit of paganism.

not the destroyer, but the maker of laws; not only patron of right, but its very codex—hast hardly allowed a single letter of justice to be erased which thou hast felt in thy heart. But doubt not that this petition is consonant with right, conceived in piety, concluded in reason; for I seek to be ruled by that monarch worthy of the diadem, legitimate without simony or fraud, whom thy holy hand hath subjected to an interdict.

POPE. What madness, citizens, what foolish urgency impels you to so great a crime? What Erinnys goads you that you wish to relieve Otto? Is it your will that the spoliator of the Roman Church, the enemy of the Catholic faith, haughty not only from the habit of ruling but from arrogance of soul, should become powerful, he who so degraded the dignity of the clergy, denying the episcopate, declaring that abbots were no more than monks, bishops but priests, and that there should be no precedence among the clergy? Will Otto please you better than Frederick, a tyrant rather than a king, the son of a duchess before the son of an empress, an opponent of the faith instead of a defender?

ROME. What goad of justice pricks thee to opposition, what reason or what wisdom is in thee, O Father, that thou becomest uncertain in the air of spring? Not long ago thou wert friendly to Otto. Thou wert his ally against Philip, against adverse fortune, against the majority in the empire, against the whole world; and now why hast thou turned against him? A Castor in blood, an Alcides in strength, an Alexander in bounty, he considers not what is to be given, nor to whom, but by whom. He is not inimical to the Roman Church nor to the faith, nor is he vain of his power. He discredited not the clergy, though he may have called abbots monks and bishops clerics; for

in this he said only the truth. To attribute the virtues of both Otto and Frederick to Frederick alone as thou hast done is no comparison. Be just to both. Let not Frederick be called king, but boy; nor Otto tyrant, but king. It is not Otto who is haughty, but Frederick.

POPE. Madness arms thee, Rome, against the Father and against thyself, to dare oppose thy words to mine. On my side adverse to thee stand universal opinion, thine own foolish petition, and my just refusal. I have promised. But if thou wert in the right, thou hadst suffered no refusal. The agreement puts me under no obligation to thee. I appeal not to the decretals but to reason. Let logic not argument decide between us.

ROME. That sentence of thine is divine, nothing less. And do thou begin since thou art the greater.

POPE. He who makes a promise puts himself under obligation to him who receives the promise. He fulfills his promise not of mere choice, but because he ought. Hence he who revokes a promise denies a duty. While Otto feared an obstacle to his coronation, he allured me with cunning promises, as you know, that were really made, not to me, but to the Church of St. Peter. But after he had been invested with the symbols of empire, he not only refused to fulfill his promises, but denied that he had made any. Thus he deprived the Roman Church of its rights. Plainly he is toward the Church a robber. Therefore it is not expedient that he be raised up, now that he is fallen. Moreover, the moment he received the diadem, unmindful of the honor conferred upon him, he did violence to thee, forcing thy markets and refusing payment for supplies. For thus attacking Roman liberties he ought to be deposed or he ought not. If he ought to be deposed then thou art in the wrong to demand his restoration; another should suc-

ceed him and none by better right than he who was elected before him, namely Frederick. Therefore Frederick ought to succeed to the kingdom. But if Otto ought not to be deposed, then hath he attacked thy liberties with impunity; and if he recovers the throne and by thy help is given a chance of committing a worse offense by which thy liberties shall be vacated altogether, which God forbid, in either case the blame will be thine. Again, despising the anathema, Otto refused to be reconciled to us when he could; nor of his own wish doth he now come to us, but under the stress of adverse fortune. Is he, then, to be reconciled to us, after his lapse, who in prosperity held us in scorn? He shall not rise whom I have not cast down, for it was not by our power that he was deposed but by the power of the apostolic anathema. And it is not ours to relieve him. It is not for man to restore what God has overthrown. Who scorns the power of anathema? Otto. Who hath been always an adversary of the faith? Otto. Therefore, let common sense decide whether one justly deposed can rightly be restored. Such is my argument. Show the fallacy in this chain of enthymemes, Rome, or yield to reason.

ROME. To thy propositions I respond briefly, maintaining: first, that if he who promises does so of his own choice, he should be held to fulfilment; but if he promises under compulsion, the case is different. Otto made his promise to thee not freely but under duress, since without it thou wouldst not crown him. So, then, Otto is under no obligation, nor was his throne forfeit by his denial of thy claim. In this argument thy purpose is deceitful. Again, certain of the German soldiery seized salable things without paying the owners. But this was not by Otto's command. As soon as he was

informed, he forbade it and ordered that our losses be made good, and so well was he obeyed that we gained tenfold. What could Otto more? Even if he had known the depredations of his men from the outset, that would not excuse the effort to depose him. It is no proof of opposition to thee or to the church that Otto observes his oath to guard the integrity of his empire. Thou seekest what he cannot give. In preserving his realm undivided, he was perplexed with doubt between downright perjury and an unmerited anathema. Wherefore, in a fire of anxiety, he sought a way of evading at the same time both difficulties. But thou meanwhile, wickedly hast labored by fraud to draw away the multitude from Otto to his enemy. Lest sordid theft seem to have a prosperous outcome, let Otto be restored. It was not God who deposed him, but foul treachery. My petition is just. Thy plea that Otto has lapsed in divine things is not true. Thou arguest from that very thing which remains to be proved, and a conclusion reached by begging the question must be false. So Otto is excused. Against Frederick I reply: his diminutive stature is undeniable; he must be either a boy or a dwarf. If a boy, then his age unfits him for empire; for it is written that none shall be king of the Romans till he shall have passed the age of six lustra. If a dwarf, then the avaricious nature of such unfits him to bear rule. There is no remedy for a natural defect, nor hope of outgrowing it; in flowing water there is no prey for cranes. Again a boy is never humble, and short stature is always arrogant. By contrast Otto cannot be proud, since opposites are the effects of opposites. Haughty to humble, lifeless to living, Frederick to Otto labors to succeed; Thersites, a dwarf, a pigmy, seeks to bear the burden of Alcides, a giant, a Teuton. Since such presumption is

beyond nature, the boy corrupted by vain ambition rises on high only that he may fall to more complete ruin. The effort to depose him whom the favor of Holy Church and thine own hands have canonically enthroned, this it is which hath lessened thine own rights and those of the church. He whose inflated pride, blind ambition, deceitfulness and envy inspire him, though scarcely worthy of life, with the wish to reign, to supplant one better than himself, knows not that he is merely grieved by the merits of another, wishing to appropriate them to himself, spurning the decrees of the Senate and the rights of the Roman Church. Who wishes to degrade the patrician of Rome? Frederick. Who destroys the right of Holy Church? Frederick. Who prepares the fall of the whole empire? Frederick. Let universal reason decide whether or not the empire ought to be committed to him.

POPE. I deny the premises. Frederick, it is true, is short but not the shortest. He is larger than many who are neither boys nor dwarfs. The inference then is deceitful. No boy humble, thou sayest. But if one could be found, then to God be the glory. On the other hand, Otto's stature is no proof of humility. Frederick's accession takes away naught of the right of the church: for this happens not of his own motion, but by act of mine in behalf of the church. He is not the envious but the envied, happy he, wretched the other. He scorns not the rights of the senate or of the Roman church. He has no wish to degrade the patrician or to bring about the fall of the empire but to avert a fall; he is cheer after grief and after wormwood nectar.

ROME. Thy response is not wise but cunning, not rational but wilful, offering me not proof, but a sophism. Asked for a lantern you sell me a bladder. But if

Frederick be substituted for Otto, the timid for the brave, the dwarf for the man; when he is canonically enthroned, the other betrayed, then perish law, civic honor, the integrity of the empire and of the statutes. Why is this? Neither guilt in Otto nor merit in Frederick requires it. Three and no more are the causes which warrant the anathema against an emperor: putting away his empress, diminution of the imperial honor, heresy. Otto, free from offence in all these points, should not be bound by the anathema. But he whose guilt is not equal to the minor penalty, hath not incurred the major penalty. If the anathema be not deserved, much less dethronement. Thou hast bound the innocent in the fetters of anathema, and so what thou hast done is done de facto and not de jure. Thou hast in this violated law. Thou hast made thy whim a reason.

POPE. Silence, Rome. What boots this loquacity? While thou actest thus the step-daughter, imputing to a true father a false crime, why dost thou wish to raise him whom God hath put down? Thou deniest the crime of Otto. But in laboring to diminish the right of the Roman Church, he hath lessened the honor of the empire, and is therefore rightly deposed. I am thy lord, thy father, punisher, ruler, defender; thou hast gone too far; thou shalt not escape without chastisement. The hour comes in which I shall be avenged. Beware of more words now under penalty of anathema. Since thou art not logical but sophistical, far be it from me to dispute further with thee. Otto shall not be restored. Is it right for me to reverse my acts? If the arguments for the establishing of Frederick in Otto's place convince thee not, it is enough that I choose to have it so. Take my will for a reason.

ROME. What kind of an apostolic response is this?

What sort of a successor of Peter is this our Apostate? What sort of a servant of the servants of Christ, who threatens to rule the world by his own whim without reason. Oh! crime of the clergy, disgrace of the world, vessel of sin, why dost thou neglect knowledge of thyself. Thou art Innocentius, but the In is not privative, it is augmentative; thou art worse than Nocent, a nuisance to the whole world, not apostolic but apostate, not pastor but wolf feeding on thine own flock, not father but stepfather to the church foolishly asserting that thine irrational wish shall rule the world. Henceforth we must live without law, no better than brutes. God forbid. I call a general council against thee, against Frederick, against the enemies of Rome. [To the Council.] O, pious supporters of the Holy Faith, holy stones of Jerusalem, assembly of the Holy Church, dispersion to your flocks, disruption to the empire, destruction to Rome, are imminent because of this wicked shepherd. Let him suffer the penalty which he unjustly sought to inflict. If reason, right, solicitude for the flock inspire you, give us a better pastor, one who will rule the world in reason, not in mere fantasy; with skill, not by chance; let him raise the humble and put down the proud.

COUNCIL. Mother Rome, it is not ours to depose the Pope. As for the rest, thy petition is just. We depose Frederick and restore Otto.

VI

That this kind of dialogue in which a symbolical impersonation is treated as real was otherwise known is shown by an anonymous poem on the destruction of the city of Milan in the year 1162.

The dialogue, as in the above disputation, is in hexameter, and is carried on by Milan, speaking as an individual, and a sympathetic foreign traveler.[1] It expresses the hope of restoration; and this was soon after provided for by the Lombard League in 1167. Two centuries later this imperfect dramatic form still retained a certain attractiveness, as shown in the dialogue on the destruction of Cesena, attributed by some to Petrarch. Both these works were of course Italian. The nationality of the *Disputation* is not so easily settled. The manuscript belongs to England,[2] but the mythological tendencies seem to be those of Italy in the twelfth century after a partial recovery from the antique witchcraft which was the real religion even of the papacy in the middle of the tenth century. Possibly the explanation is that the poem was a humorous report of the dispute written in Italy. The unusual compliment paid by the poet to the Germans may be accounted for by his evident Guelf sympathies. The fact that all pieces of the kind have Italian subjects seems also to argue an

[1] Ronca, *Cultura medioevale e poesie latina d'Italia nel secoli XI e XII*, Vol. I, p. 81.

[2] Leibnitz, *Scriptores rerum Brunsvicensium*, Vol. II, p. 48, Introduction. The sentence has historical value for more than one purpose: "Carmen hoc breve dialogi forma, ex Bibliotheca Cottoniana (nunc laudabili cura Senatus magnae Britanniae summi, ad publicos usus redemta), pro me eruit theologus Ecclesiae Anglicanae celeberrimus. Thomas Smithus, misitque vir, actis regni publicis editis meritissimus, Thomas Rymerus. *Vitellius D. XIV n. 6.*" It might be worth while to consider on what points these lines would be decisive, if all other material were lost. There are at least four.

Italian origin. In fact, the dialectical disputation in verse took a quite different form in the North of Europe, adapted to allegory or satire. Testimony to the popularity of the disputation in verse is furnished by the curious Goliardic poem, "The Priest and the Logician," written about the close of the twelfth century and usually attributed, though with no certainty, to Walter Mapes.[1] The Logician in this case is merely a member of the regular clergy who is supposed to have read Plato and Socrates, and to be acquainted generally with profane literature, while the Presbyter, as a secular priest, claims the excuse of religion for not knowing such things. The difference is the same as that between Chaucer's "Parson and the vagrant friars," but viewed from an entirely different vantage-point. Here the dispute turns at last on the great moral question of the twelfth century—the right of a clergyman to have a female companion as a wife. This, of course, was also a race question, the peoples of Latin culture prizing the celibacy of the priesthood, while Greeks and Teutons revolted at the thought of familiarity between the sexes without marriage. Logicus thinks his studies and his manner of life less offensive than the priest's violation of the rule of celibacy. The priest does not pretend to call the woman whom

[1] Wright, *Latin Poems attributed to Walter Mapes* (Camden Society), pp. 251 ff.

he loves his wife, though she bears children to him. The trouble is that the doubt as to his rights has had the usual effect in such cases—to make him indifferent to more primitive laws of decency. Logicus tells him that he spares neither wife nor widow nor maid, nor old nor young, nor big nor little;[1] and the priest, reddening with shame, calls the debate off till vespers, when he silences his tormentor by a trick and gets him beaten by members of the congregation.

If it were unquestionable that this disputation of Presbyter and Logicus had its origin with Walter Mapes, there would be little doubt but that the reading of Terence had much to do with the lightness and vivacity of such dialogues. Mapes, born about 1143 and missing from history after 1196, was, like his friend Gerald of Barri, a born story-teller. He has left proof in the way of quotation and allusion that Terence was with him a favorite author, and that his own natural tendency, hampered by the limited culture of his time, was toward dramatic form. He appreciated long before Chaucer's time the contrast of persons in a lively narrative. He could not tell a story without representing his characters in action and making

[1] Balzac illustrates the indiscriminate lust of the professed celibate in several of his short tales; but perhaps the most fantastic examples are found in the Latin poems of Moneta belonging to the age of Louis XIV. They are past quotation even in a dead language. See Olivetus, *Recentiores poetae Latini et Graeci selecti quinque* (2d ed.), pp. 307-65.

them speak for themselves. The poetry that has been attributed to him cannot be assumed as a proof of his quality, though much of it is in the form of dialogue, because the authorship is dubious. But fortunately his prose is authentic and decisive. In one place of his *Nugae curialium*, to illustrate the difficulties with which a king has to contend—the example in his mind being that extremely energetic and busy monarch, Henry II—on account of the incompetence, selfishness, and laziness of his courtiers and officers, Mapes tells how he is himself treated on a certain estate which he has in the country; how his bailiffs and stewards are worn out and driven away by the plots of a crowd of dependents; how these rack their brains to evade labor and to secure an excess of eating, drinking, and idleness; how cunningly they flatter his vanity; how they slyly attract guests to the place as a pretext for a lavish table; how they keep him in a good humor with these unwelcome intruders and drown every protest in a jovial tumult, so that he feels, as he says, like the paterfamilias in Terence's play who declared that of all his property nothing was his own but himself.[1]

I come back from church early [he exclaims] and see that those troublesome visitors have not yet departed. Of course, they want to stay for dinner, and one of my own people says in their behalf, "They think

[1] Wright, *Gualteri Mapes, De Nugis Curialium* (Camden Society), pp. 12 f.

it a long way to an inn, and they know not what they may find there. Throw the handle after the axe; you have begun well, let the end be as good. Trouble not about the waste of provisions; God hath not yet given away all. Public rumor is that they will make you a bishop. Away then with stinginess. Pour out all your good things. Nothing ventured, nothing won. Fortune favors the fearless. Let him pinch the crust that hath nothing else. Put forth all your strength; keep nothing back, lest you prevent coming success."

Thus is he wheedled, and the king, he says, is equally the sport and the victim of flatterers and parasites. Many other anecdotes might be cited to show that Mapes fairly impersonated the characters that he wished his readers to see and hear. Invariably, if the context permits, he puts conversational passages in strict dramatic form, the name of each speaker in turn, and then the words. One of his tales in particular can be reduced almost to the form of a complete play merely by stripping away the elaborate narrative.[1] In this tale the principal personage is Galo, nephew of a king of Asia, who has unfortunately awakened passions a trifle too warm in the heart of his uncle's wife. Rendered anxious by her eager and unwelcome attentions, he consults his friend Sadius, who endeavors to convince the queen that Galo is incapable of loving any woman. The queen sends one of her maids to flirt with Galo. Then she works herself up to a jealous rage in

[1] *De nugis curialium*, pp. 108 ff., Distinc. III, cap. ii.

which she plots his death. He abandons the court, and has an adventure with a giant which ends in single combat before the king. Galo wins, but, in order to convict the queen of her treachery, he fights in the armor of Sadius. She, of course, falls into the trap and mingles her praises of the supposed Sadius with bitter reflections on the cowardice of Galo, thus preparing the way for her own public disgrace. Usually the fate of the wicked lady in tales upon the theme of Joseph and Potiphar's wife, is to be burned at the stake.[1] But the queen in this case is left to her own self-contempt—a refinement of which western Europe was hardly capable in the twelfth century.

GALO AND SADIUS

CHARACTERS

King of Asia	Queen of Asia
Galo, the King's nephew	Ero, maid to the Queen
Sadius, Galo's friend	Lais, maid to the Queen
Rivius, a giant	Damsel, friend of Galo against Rivius

Messenger, courtiers, ladies, citizens

ACT I, SCENE 1

Queen, Galo

[This is a scene in which the Queen, dressed like a wanton, tempts Galo. It is merely described in the tale.]

[1] Oesterley, *Dolopathos*, p. 82, ll. 26 f.; Godfrey of Viterbo, *Pantheon*, pars XVII., Rubric, *De Othone tertio, Imperatore octuagesimo ab Augusto;* Struvius, *Pistorius*, II, pp. 328 ff.

ACT I, SCENE 2

Galo, Messenger, Sadius

[Galo hears the message from the Queen, and severely rebukes the messenger.]

GALO. Thou feelest at last, Sadius, the anxiety of thy friend?

SADIUS. And share it.

ACT I, SCENE 3

Sadius, Queen

SADIUS [praising the Queen's goodness]. Lucretia may now confess herself overcome. The man lives not who presumes to hope for such constancy of mind. One alone I know, whom I could praise for the like virtue. But what others admire in him, I doubt not to be a defect.

QUEEN. Who is he?

SADIUS. Surely he is incomparable among men. But the Lord who endowed him with all felicity, damned him in this alone, though he calls it his salvation.

QUEEN. But who is he?

SADIUS. I pray you, keep the secret.

QUEEN. Most faithfully.

SADIUS. My Galo. For he could have from women whatever he would. But to me alone he admits his defect. [Exit.]

[The Queen, overcome by disappointment, falls in a fainting fit.]

ACT II, SCENE 1

[The Queen plans a new temptation for Galo. Instructs her maid Ero how to act and sends her to him.]

ACT II, SCENE 2

[Judging from some almost contemporary dramatic pieces, Mapes's sense of decency here leads him to avoid the rehearsal of a warm love passage between Ero and Galo.]

ACT II, SCENE 3

Queen

QUEEN. She goes, and there her companion whom I love not now, nor will I name him, meets her as he is wont to meet me. Oh, how faithful and benign always, how tender and compassionate! But how obstinate he to my —— who so often repelled me and escaped from my arms, with soft but surely intoxicating speech led me, and named me the most beautiful of all, queen of all, and especially his own queen. Oh, how truly his, to whom I would be a slave! How kindly he called me the spouse consecrated to the king and swore that himself and all his were mine, except in this. Good God, how great a thing is that this! Everything I sought was that this. That was all things. Why then did he say, except this. But all except all is nothing; and so he might have said truly, "My Lady, I make all thy grace nothing." Would that he had not with his blunt speech revealed his intention to me and punished me by an eternal repulse! God, who ever snatched himself away from such embraces, and naked embraces, too? Or, are the sighs of youths to me a lie, and also an aged and true mirror, or can this face awaken passion in any man?

Oh, but I forgot. Surely Sadius is faithful and true. And is Galo insipid, who from me his shame ——, who permitted himself not to be allured, who repelled me lest I repel him? It is not to be believed Sadius is false. He is without defect.

But Oh, wretched and foolish me! A girl able and cautious have I sent on this, my own affair. Where was my mind? She slipped away to him and carried herself modestly and quietly until she came into his hands and at the first touch was known to be other than I; and if not, then she has confessed herself and has been gladly received into the intimacies that should be mine. This, once will she be or twice before she returns; and what if she persevere and shall love and shall be loved? I believe not, I opine not, certain am I and without doubt that already he—her; for me before—if it had not been for the consecration of my head. Not my wifehood only, but his own good faith withholds him. But what is in the way here? Nothing, and surely the deed is done. There is no occasion to say, all things except, but first of all things this is to do. How joyful she; how quickly she caught the word from my lips, without a question. Truly she was not slow, nor timid; there was no bear in the way, no lion abroad, when she went. Here it is dawn and she not here. Oh, how swift in her going, how safe; how slow, how fearful in her coming back. Now the bear is in the way, the lion is in the fields. It is his violence that detains her, and far from unwilling is she to suffer such violence. But why do I complain? Who is to blame? I have defrauded myself; traitress to myself, I set the snare in which I am caught. She has done nothing but what I would have done. But is Sadius true? No, no, he is naught. He is a proper man; it is manifest; or she would have returned. All the signs are there—the smooth down softer than that of the peach; no unwholesome fat, no lividness in the eyes, no trembling of the heart. Can he be effeminate, so vigorous a man-at-arms, the praise of all? Right am I, Sadius is a liar. But she whom I involved so care-

fully in my plans, who already enjoys him, who for him neglects me, certainly she took my pleasure gladly enough. And what is to be said for me but that every lover is lunatic.

ACT II, SCENE 4

Queen, Lais

QUEEN. Ho, Lais, when did Ero go out?[1]

LAIS. Just now, at first cock-crow.

QUEEN. She was sent in the evening.

LAIS. Later.

QUEEN. Why so late returning?

LAIS. Sent late, back late.

QUEEN. Knowest thou our errand and why she was sent?

LAIS. No. But I know that she made ready with all haste and gayly festive and late departed.

QUEEN. She is grieving; why festive?

LAIS. With necklaces, rings, unguents, purple, cotton, perfume, curl; not even was wanting the needle to the smooth skin.

QUEEN. Dear me, all for what?

LAIS. Truly, I know not. But she forgot nothing that she would have thought of, if going to a lover; anointed, bathed, coiffured, powdered, wreathed, she appeared, nothing lacking in gold, gown or any accessory and not a word about coming back.

QUEEN. I thought her so naïve, unconscious of all arts.

[1] It is impossible to quote the whole of the tale in Latin. But this passage will illustrate the rapid dramatic style of the original:

Heus, Lai, quando recessit Ero?
LAIS. Nunc in primo gallicantu.
REGINA. Quae missa crepusculo.
LAIS. Cadium.
REGINA. Quare tam sero?
LAIS. Sero missa, sero redibit. Etc.

LAIS. Unconscious! Oh, how cunning in an affair of this sort, if it be right to say so.

QUEEN. Good my Lais, tell it all.

LAIS. I know not, but I suspect that she sought Galo.

QUEEN. Why Galo?

LAIS. She pretends otherwise, that she may be loved the more.

QUEEN. But it is said that he has no love for women.

LAIS. Ero knows better already.

QUEEN. Ero?

LAIS. Ero.

QUEEN. Ours?

LAIS. I know no other.

QUEEN. How knowest thou this?

LAIS. By sure tokens.

QUEEN. They may deceive.

LAIS. Oh, above all madness, unhappy love betrays its victim to the eyes of others. May I speak boldly.

QUEEN. Good Lais, be as bold as you will.

LAIS. Galo, though bred far from us, knows the way to veins and heart.

QUEEN. Whose heart?

LAIS. Not thine, I hope. For he has filled mine with anguish; and there is not another maid, to my knowledge, who has escaped this pain. But I hear the door.

QUEEN. She it may be. Away, lest she find us together. [Exit Lais.]

ACT III, SCENE 1

Queen, Ero

QUEEN. Ah, Ero! Thou hast come at last.

ERO. I have come.

QUEEN. Well, what happened?

ERO. I did as you bade me and was repulsed, but I have no doubt of him.

QUEEN. Why didst thou not return at once? Was delay pleasing? Time passed thus is given to desire.

ERO. I hastened as well as I could, having but just gone on the errand. How was I to get back sooner than I did.

QUEEN. If thou hadst gone when I told thee, thou mightst have run ten miles; but thou must be dressed. Wentst thou to a husband?

ERO. To obey thee I had to please him; and I had surely pleased him, if I had been thou. I was turned out only because I was myself.

QUEEN. Now I know that thou art a wicked woman and no maid. [Tears her hair, beats her face, etc., etc.]

ACT III, SCENE 2

Queen, Galo

[The Queen again attempts to overcome Galo's scruples. Her violence reacts in rage and hatred.]

ACT IV, SCENE 1

Galo, the Queen, and others

[King's birthday banquet. The guests seated at a semicircular table so that each is equally distant from the King at the center on the straight side. Galo and Sadius sit together, but Galo is apparently absorbed in his own thoughts. The Queen anxiously watches him eager to know what is in his mind. According to custom the King swears to give her on this day whatever she asks. Her request is that Galo be compelled to confess to the whole assembly his inmost thoughts. There is a general protest. The King is ashamed and dismayed,

but the Queen insists. Galo at last, as if rising out of a dream, stands and speaks.]

GALO. A year ago come Pentecost, worn out by the prolonged heat of fevers at Salona, I was sitting on my couch of sickness the fifth day *post creticum*. It was a festival and my nurses weary of their labors, with the rest of my family, took part in the ceremonies of the occasion. I thought to arm myself and to escape out of the city to try my strength. My horse and arms were brought. I donned mail-coat and helmet and took up my weapons with difficulty; for the rest I was too weak. I mounted my horse which from lack of exercise had grown fat and let him take his own course. After the city was left behind, I fell into a forest path and from morn to eve never drew rein. The horse quickly carried me unwitting into remote parts of which I knew nothing. I would have turned back but I no longer knew the way. I blamed love for my wandering; for I loved and was not beloved. Ignorant of the ways, I was carried at last to the environs of a great and wonderful castle. I admired the lofty palaces overtopping the fortress wall, the ivory whiteness of the domes and the beauty of the whole work. Through an open gate and down the middle of the enclosure I rode heedless of everything but my own thoughts. Even in the loftiest of the palaces I found nobody, but having passed through the vast halls and thence into a wide garden, I beheld a maid under a flowering plum tree, sitting royally in silken robe. I attempted to salute her, but from sheer weakness fell at her feet, where I lay a long time in a kind of dream. She on her part gave no sign that she saw me but sat immobile as a statue. Finally I managed to rise, and casting aside shield and spear knelt before her as a suppliant, humbly saluting her and adding whatever

I thought might gain a response. But not a word did she utter. I was ashamed to turn back without even a sign and I threatened her with violence. Seeing herself at my mercy, she cried out, "Rivius." Instantly appeared a giant of incredible size, whom no warrior here, unless the King or Sadius could hope to meet on equal terms. His eyes shone like burning lamps and I feared him greatly. For the sake of the King and the nobles present, may the queen pity me, lest my confession become an eternal disgrace to me.

[Here the King and the others endeavor to pacify the queen, who merely stares at Galo in stubborn silence.]

GALO. The giant, though furious, disdained to attack me till I had armed myself. At the first shock his strength was such that he lifted me armed as I was into the fork of a tree, propping me there with his lance and joining with his damsel in mocking my misery. Is it not yet enough, oh Queen?

[Again persuasions of the King and all; wrathful silence on the part of the Queen.]

GALO. Then came to my aid another damsel, unknown to me till that moment, and she casting herself at the feet of the cruel maid besought mercy for me. She kissed her feet, wetting them with vain tears, vain truly, for the haughty damsel kicked her in the mouth and wounded her lips. Queen, is it not enough? Was ever more wretched case than mine? But I know thou pitiest me not, and I will tell all. My damsel, worthy of one far nobler, kissed the feet of the giant with her bleeding lips, and prayed him to avoid the disgrace of fighting a man weakened by long sickness. The giant reddened but still awaited the permission of his own damsel who sat motionless with averted face. Then my damsel in her love and pity for me, weeping bitterly because she

could not make peace, sought grace for a year and gave herself as hostage for my appearance. The day is here, and the damsel who befriended me, with five hundred knights, is within the gates. The giant follows with five thousand warriors. Meditation upon my peril made me dull at table, for it is to me terrible.

QUEEN. The giant's damsel, whom thou revilest because she favored thee not, was constant and firm and praiseworthy even in those things which thou sayest against her. It is thy custom to speak evil. Now weep thou, let tears burst out, because I am no giant or that she may come, thy praise, thy love, who conquers the giant, whose tears are enough to raise the dead, to allay the wrath of demons. Oh, how well thou praisest her whom thou praisest, her whose grief is more effectual than the songs of Orpheus. What is Amphion to these tears? They would have raised the walls of Thebes without music. Hercules the conqueror dripped sweat usefully throughout the world; but if she had wished, her tears would be more useful. Now let her weep, let the illustrious King give command. Here let her pray: "Attend senate, and surely, reverence reserved of the King and of these present, I shall remain victorious." Let us hear the whole.

GALO. Thou shalt hear what will mislike thee, and the greater disgrace to thee between the prayers of the King and his peers and thy denials. At last firmly in meditation I decided, though the day was set, not to appear, either because of my sworn promise which thou tearest, or because of loss or gain, credit or honor, or any other chance, against the giant armed or unarmed. We had called by oath upon our lord the King and him to be present with forces on each side, but this is of no use now, because I shall not meet the giant. Let Her-

cules be invoked, and in his club he sees monsters due to his courage, a task reserved for his labors, titles added not to man but to a god. You have heard all, not one iota of my ignominy is hidden from you; I have laid open the shames of past defeats and future fears. What more is there in which the queen can or will injure me? For me nothing remains unless to betake myself to some vast solitude where men are unknown and let my name be effaced from the earth, to slip like Empedocles into the flames of Aetna, to fall on the sword of Pirinus, or to throw myself among the devouring beasts of Neptune; lest, if I continue to live, I become a byword and an object to be pointed at with the finger of scorn. From this light swiftly shall I go out, bereft of those to whom the liberty of life is conceded, who dare to speak a helping word and to suppress a deadly saying. I brought a free head hither and silence is laid upon my mouth lest I speak that I would not, or pass in silence what I ought not. Oh, deadly servitude and worse than death. Free is the mind of those wicked and in chains and able to go whither it will; to me happens what happens not even to those condemned of capital crime, that the soul is bound and given a sacrifice to foolish shame. A knight, not long ago a knight, now a monster, victim of knights and of a woman, I know not what sin I am obliged to expiate. [Exit, most of the assembly retiring with him out of sympathy.]

QUEEN. [To increase his supposed dismay, vociferating.] From the mouth of Galo we have heard the proofs of his cowardice in that he will most certainly not face this giant. These are the purchased praises of the rabble extolling Galo to the skies, these are the assertions of his own mouth and of his falling pride.

He calls his foe a giant. Would that we knew if he be a giant. We had learned that all the giants perished by the hand of Hercules. Galo's word is that of a frightened man, conquered, whipped and stupefied by defeat. Truly enough of a giant is he who made a dwarf prouder than any giant by a single stroke. Let the gods dread his spear and take heed of the resuscitated titans. Let Steropes and Pyragmon sweat to arm him with mountains. Let Jupiter seize his lightnings, Mars his helmet, Phoebus his darts, Pallas her ægis, Diana her quivers. Or, if there be such giants as this fellow describes, let Stilbon create illusions between the opposing lines in order to balance inequality. Galo has told of battles; rejoice, Sadius, grieve no more, and snatch thy innocence from envy.

ACT IV, SCENE 2

Sadius, Galo

SADIUS. I know and the world knows thy valor; but thou owest me all confidence, for thou holdest my soul in thy heart's service. As no power can restrain me in the vows I make to thee, so do thou let no goads move thee to avoid my companionship or to flee society. The tale which the queen extorted from thee may be credible enough, all but the confession of cowardice. That was never in thy heart. But I will take up the battle with the giant. Let me have thine armor. Let me fight in thy name. Then thou wilt escape defeat, or haply, if I win, the triumph will be thine and so our friendship will be safe from every accident in which malice might rejoice.

GALO. Let Mother Faith be glad and let her from her long exile return joyful to her native earth. Sadius is her defender, let her glory in security. Thy love

hath found a way for my return in honor. We will secretly exchange armor; but I will fight in thy semblance. If I am slain, the truth will be manifest; if I conquer, then together we will celebrate the victory. Before the combat, thou wilt announce to the king and the queen that thou art to do battle in my stead. Of thy friendship, also, seek out the lady who gave herself for my freedom, reveal to her alone our stratagem, and console her throughout the battle with companionship, perchance, of a lady from our side or one of the strangers. Thou shalt know her by her stature above the middle height, by her slender neck, her modest carriage, the happy elegance of her figure, her charm of manner and those open graces which give assurance of hidden beauty.

ACT V, SCENE 1

Galo in the armor of Sadius, Rivius

[The lists with the tents and seats of the King and his court on one side, those of the giant Rivius on the other. Place of tourney between. The first fight is on horseback, the giant bestriding a steed proportionate to his own bulk. At the onset he breaks his lance on Galo's shield. Galo kills the giant's horse.]

RIVIUS. Since thou hast put thyself in Galo's place, thou wilt not force an unequal meeting with an unarmed man. Dismount then and give me equal battle on foot.

[The King deplores the supposed absence of his nephew from the field. The Queen is witty at the expense of Galo on the score of cowardice and maddened at sight of Sadius in Galo's armor in company with Galo's lady. The giant, beaten in sword-play by the champion in the armor of Sadius, turns to flee and is wounded, but returns to the fight. Then he breaks his sword and is permitted to get another.]

GALO. Glory is to be won by courage, not by accident.

RIVIUS [seizing his magic sword, cuts down his servant, exclaiming] Wicked slave, this would have given me victory at the first stroke. [To Galo] Woe to thee, who hast ventured in Galo's stead to oppose me! Thou art certainly a much better man than Galo; but now yield thyself my prisoner, if thou preferrest life to death.

GALO. What that sword has given thee of courage and spirit, is not of thy virtue but of my indulgence; use it, if thou canst, I am secure not in arms but in hope and vigor. My honor is my help.

[The new sword cuts away part of Galo's helmet, and, were it not for his skill, would be dangerous; but he keeps the giant on the defensive, and, after many passes and wounds, cuts off the giant's sword arm, snatches up the great sword, and under the name of Sadius presents himself with his prisoner before the King. He refuses to raise his helmet and departs with Sadius and the damsel.]

ACT V, SCENE 2

Galo, Sadius, The Damsel, in Galo's house

[The two knights exchange armor. Exit Sadius.]

ACT V, SCENE 3

The King, The Queen, Sadius

[The King inquires of Sadius the nature of his wounds. The Queen brings medicines and ointments.]

SADIUS. I have no need of thine ointments. Know ye that he has triumphed who still wears the mark of his victory. He has the wounds to show. He is no weakling now, but greater than the giant. I am he, the

mark of your derision, who standing by the damsel, heard my false praises and witnessed the success of Galo.

[At these words the Queen seemed as if turned to stone, but the court in general, divining what had happened, raised a glad shout. The whole city holds festival; only the Queen falls faint and ill because of her disappointment and hatred.]

This play comes so near being tragedy that it suggests reference to a real tragedy in verse written some years earlier by Bernard of Chartres. *Mathematicus* or *De parricida*[1] is a manifest variant of the legend of Oedipus. There was a famous soldier at Rome who shared with his wife one cause of deep regret: they were childless. The wife consulted an astrologer (*mathematicus*), who predicted that she would give birth to a son destined to become a great man, but also to be slayer of his father. When the son is born, the father orders the babe to be exposed in the antique fashion, but the mother secretly intrusts the child to the care of friends at a distance. He grows to manhood and wins a great battle against the Carthaginians, thus superseding his father in command of the Roman army. Of course, father and son know nothing of their relationship, but the mother is only too well aware of the young hero's identity. The old general is about to be put to death by order of the youth, when she discloses her secret,

[1] Cloetta, *Beiträge zur Litteraturgeschichte*, pp. 114, 120.

and the son resigns all his honors in order to evade the fate predicted for him. There seems to be a reminiscence of the fatal custom of the Arician priesthood in addition to that of Oedipus. The poem, like the tales of *Gesta Romanorum*, is crowded with anachronisms, but it betrays some knowledge of Roman topography, and still more of Roman mythology.

Versus de Afra et Flavio is the story of a childless couple in which the husband, hopeless of offspring, determines to abandon his wife. A year later, upon his return, his wife presents him with a son, but he refuses to believe himself the father. When his wife insists on her good faith, he beguiles her into taking a long journey, and abandons her and the babe on a desert island. Crazed by hunger, the woman kills her child, but preserves one of its little hands. Then she is rescued, tried for her crime, and acquitted, but dies by her own hand, declaring that her crime is one that must be expiated.

VII

No doubt the defects in this sketch of Galo are all due to the present transcriber, since Mapes meant only to tell a story. Nevertheless, the original will bear witness that nothing has been done except to cut away the elaborate narrative and shorten the explanatory passages, leaving the fragmentary dialogue to speak for itself. Evi-

dently it contains the substance of a play so little removed from the dramatic form as to give ground for the inference that Mapes may have had a drama as his source. He was a man of great literary power, though slovenly and indifferent in matters of style. His whole aim in writing was to secure immediate attention by the novelty of his theme or of his method in presenting it. Often he reminds one of a modern newspaper writer. His skill in welding together remote and recondite orientalism, Celtic lore, and Teutonic epic is manifest in the Arthurian romances to which he gave shape, and particularly in the episode of the Graal which he created. In the book of his old age, *De nugis curialium*, many of the narratives are chapters of history as handed down by tradition, some relate to events of recent memory, others are drawn from personal experience. One, the story of Gado, looks like a fragment of the lost English *Romance of Wade*. Another, the tale of Ollo and Sceva, has a flavor almost Chaucerian, and also resembles the story of Sadius and Galo in its dramatic possibilities. It is a story of two men who were close friends in youth, but later lived remote from each other. Ollo becomes wealthy, miserly, and distrustful. When Sceva visits him, it is only to be treated with the utmost rudeness. Sceva vows revenge. He goes to Ollo's house when the latter is far away on a trading journey, ingratiates himself with

the wife and servants, cultivates the good-will of the townspeople, bribes the officers of the law, and in short takes Ollo's place, so that the latter, when he returns, is met with blank unrecognition and turned away as a vagabond. In order to get his own again, the miser is obliged to promise immunity for all the affronts that have been put upon him.

To return to the tale of *Sadius and Galo*—orientalism, real or assumed, stands confessed on every page. The title of "king of Asia" used in it is unknown to history, but answers well to the Asiarch[1] so frequent in Asia Minor both before and after the Roman conquest, besides being closely descriptive of the Saracen sultan as he seemed to European fancy at the close of the twelfth century. While the name "Galo" may be of Teutonic origin, answering to the Frankish "Walo," still it bears a resemblance also to the Doric "Gelo." "Ero"—merely another way of spelling "Hero"—and "Lais," were not only known to Greek antiquity, but were familiar as stage names for Byzantine actresses to the latest times, the *lascivae nomina famae* of Ausonius. "Sadius" appears to be truly Asiatic. It is the Latinized form of "Said," "Saad," or "Saadi," familiar to Arabian and Per-

[1] Holm, *History of Greece* (Engl. transl.), Vol. IV, p. 609: "We make fun of well-born Asiatics for calling themselves Asiarchs after their year of office has expired." Long after Mapes's time Europeans found a king or an emperor in every petty American chieftain.

sian story-tellers, the name of Mohammed's adopted son in Koranic tradition, and in literary history, of a distinguished Persian poet, the author of *Gulistan*. Where Mapes obtained the name "Rivius" is hard to tell; but there is room for the suspicion that he may have had in mind the *summis extantem Riphea sylvis* of Ovid, though that Ripheus was a centaur, not a giant. The episode of Rivius may be taken as Mapes's own addition to the tale—one that a man contemplating the endless combats in the Arthur romance, many of which were of his own imagining, would find it easy to write.

Aside from the name "Sadius," there is nothing exclusively trans-Byzantine in the tale. The freedom of women at banquets and elsewhere with men is not characteristic of social life east of Byzantium. Another tale by Mapes, that of the *Fortunate Shoemaker*, shows that he took up Constantinopolitan legends readily enough when they came in his way. It is possible, then, to suppose that he had a Byzantine fiction, perhaps even a play, reported by a wandering fabulist, or read in an accidental manuscript, out of which to fashion his work. The easily recovered dramatic form seems to show that he kept very close to his model, for it would certainly be difficult to find many pieces of similar construction in twelfth-century Latin. Mapes made no pretense of inventing the

stories in his book. The fiction is all obviously gathered up, and the historical essays contain either personal observation or hearsay and tradition. So, in the case under consideration, he evidently used what came to him orally or in manuscript.

The book *De nugis curialium* was confessedly wrought into its present shape after Mapes's retirement in 1196 from public life. But many of the articles were written before that date. Up to 1187, the date of Gerald de Barri's book on Ireland, Mapes had apparently published little or nothing in Latin. For Gerald represents him as saying:

> You have written a great deal, Master Giraldus, and you will write much more; and I have made many discourses; you have employed writing, I speech. But, though your writings are far better, and much more likely to be handed down to future ages, than my speeches; yet, as all the world could understand me, speaking as I did in the vulgar tongue, while your works, being written in Latin, are understood by only a very few persons, I have reaped some advantage from my sermons; but you addressing yourself to princes, learned and liberal, no doubt, but now out of date and passed away from the world, have not been able to secure any sort of reward for your excellent works, notwithstanding their merit.

The unavoidable inference is that, aside from the Arthur romances composed in French at the wish of Henry II, Mapes published nothing he considered worthy of remark till after that king's

death in 1189.[1] The story of *Galo and Sadius*, then, belongs to the last decade of the twelfth century.

The argument respecting the Goliardic poetry attributed to Mapes takes a dilemmatic form. He might, no doubt with safety, have cultivated the satiric muse during his years as a student at Paris. Even bitter attacks on monks and prelates would have been overlooked in a youth of brilliant promise, supported, as he naturally would be, by his fellow-students, especially those of his own country. His name, having thus been coupled with a novel and highly popular form of literature, could be used as a cover by other scholar-poets, and so a very few verses from his own pen would suffice to make him the reputed author of the whole mass of twelfth century Latin satire. On the other hand, when he became a priest, with hopes of preferment, ready as he certainly was to accept more than one benefice, any renown as a satirist of clerical manners would have been an efficient bar to his advancement. Hence his intimate friends, who should have known of his writings, gave him in his lifetime no credit for anything aside from the well-known diatribe on marriage and a poetical attack on the Cistercian monks. The natural conclusion is that his satiric fame was posthumous, and so the

[1] Wright, *Giraldus Cambrensis*, p. 177. The original Latin is not at hand.

publication of the *Dialogus inter Aquam et Vinum*, the *Disputatio inter cor et oculum*, the *Dialogus inter corpus et animam*, the *De Clarevallensibus et Cluniacensibus*, the *De Mauro et Zoilo*, the *De presbytero et logico*, and the *Phyllis and Flora*[1] cannot be dated much before 1210. Nor can these pieces, even if they were of other authorship, be given an earlier date until Mapes is relieved positively of all responsibility for them, either direct or indirect.

It is impossible to relegate these poems to any later date for the reason that early in the thirteenth century similar pieces, in some cases on the very themes here mentioned, became popular in French under the name of *Débats*. Moreover, internal evidence shows that most of these poems, at least in their Latin form, must have been written early enough to be influenced by Italian paganism. As early as the middle of the tenth century the eyes of all Europe had been opened by the trial of Octavius, Pope John XII,[2] to the fact that the ancient Etrusco-Roman cult still survived, though rather as wizardry than as a genuine religion. The Germans, who had been for a century or more in hot conflict with heathenism, first among them-

[1] All these pieces, of course, are published in Wright's edition of Mapes's real or supposititious poems.

[2] Mapes himself shared this animosity. Thus he quoted with approval the famous anagram which made the letters R O M A stand for the words *radix omnium malorum avaritia*, and then brought it into juxtaposition with a highly indecent anecdote.

selves, then among Danes, Scandinavians, Slavs, and Magyars, were profoundly shocked by what they saw in Italy.[1] A series of German popes, including the studious Gerbert and that eminent disciplinarian Prince Bruno, rescued the papacy from vulgar superstition and started the world anew along the line of least resistance, that of a compromise between Christianity and the polished artificial religion of the ancient Roman literature. In this movement the deflection toward classical modes of thought and expression was often so extreme that Christianity was ignored altogether, and it was just by this experience that the world of the closing twelfth century began to see dimly where the boundary lay between the realm of religion and that of letters. The *Troilus* of Albertus Stadiensis, the poems[2] on Orpheus, the rhythms of *Ganymede and Helen*, of *Daedalus and Icarus*, of *Jove and Danaë*, of *Phyllis and Flora*, are formed on antique lines, without a trace of Christianity except in the poem last named. The one hundred and fifty leonine caudate distichs of date about 1075, found by Dummler in a psalter of the Chapter of Ivrea, showed an effort to treat a mythical theme with finished art. The poem dwelt on spring-time, the season of flowers, evoked

[1] This fact is either expressed or implied in all the chronicles of German origin that treat of the years between 963 and the close of the century.

[2] Ronca, *Cultura medioevale*, Vol. I, p. 125.

a beautiful nymph from the river Po, and exploited throughout, not a classical taste, but a pagan sensuousness mingled with a certain sentimentalism, the counterpart of that which is perceived in the lyrics of Provence. It is a kind of idyl, a belated souvenir of the *Cyclops* of Theocritus, a premature forecast of the Italian tragi-comedy. Later there took place a strange mingling of sacred and profane, or rather of biblical and pagan, elements—very similar to that seen in modern novels of a certain kind, where the Christianity is quite unintentional, the result of heredity or of training in childhood, while the paganism or its equivalent has been accumulated by conscious effort. In the one case as in the other, the result is a confusion anachronistic, chaotic, laughable. Thus in the *Dialogue* between Water and Wine, Thetis and Lyaeus were represented as meeting before the throne of God to argue their case with citations from Scripture. No doubt the rise of the new learning in the nascent university system of which Mapes was a distinguished representative hastened, and later chastened, this amalgamation of Christianity with classical mythology.

TRADITIONS BY WAY OF ANCIENT AND MEDIAEVAL ITALY

CHAPTER IV

TRADITIONS BY WAY OF ANCIENT AND MEDIAEVAL ITALY

I

If Warton is right, the tendency to personification, the first step toward the drama as shown in these mediaeval works, was largely due to the long-continued popularity of Boëthius.[1] But Warton had not observed that almost all thinking proceeds in the form of a conversation. It is this process which makes it so natural to say, "I debated with myself," or "I considered," where the "con" evidently implies a sort of doubling of the personality. But there is better proof of the aboriginality of this tendency in the eclogue. It is not legend but history that Theocritus developed into a form of literature that which was natural to his Sicilian fellow-countrymen. The fact is disguised in Vergil's highly artificial imitations. But nature seems to assert itself again in a poet of the mediaeval period. Bede is not usually thought of except as a compiler. But his two eclogues, the one representing the dispute between Winter and Spring and the other the death of the Cuckoo, while close

[1] Hazlitt, *Warton's History of English Poetry*, Vol. III, p. 38.

imitations of Vergil in details, are so unconventional in theme that they may justly be taken for translations or paraphrases of native Saxon songs. The prominence of the cuckoo in the spring poetry of ancient England is a fact to be considered here as a mark of identification for both of Bede's dialogic poems. For the sake of comparison with a piece of which the antecedents are even more remote from ordinary literary tradition, a translation is offered here of the eclogue on Spring and Winter:[1]

All the shepherds, descending from the cliffs and the mountains, gathered beneath the trees clothed with the tender foliage of spring, to sing songs of gladness. The youthful Daphnis and the aged Palaemon were there ready to sing the praises of the cuckoo. Spring came also, girdled and crowned with flowers, and shivering Winter with his icy beard. Between these two arose an altercation about the brave and joyous song of the cuckoo. Spring first her triple measure sang:

"I would my cuckoo, dearest bird of all, were here. In every house he is a welcome guest, for with his bright beak he trills delightful songs."

Then responded icy Winter with a voice austere: "Let not the cuckoo come, but let him sleep in the dark caverns whither he has fled. He has too light a breath for me."

SPRING. I would my cuckoo were here. He would bring the pleasant seedtime and would drive away the cold. Phoebus loves to have his friend basking in his warm rays.

[1] Beda, *Opera*, Vol. I, pp. 35 ff.

WINTER. Let not the cuckoo come. It is he who causes labors, incites to war, and disturbs our rest. He disgusts all. When he comes, land and sea are troubled.

SPRING. O slothful Winter, why do you upbraid the cuckoo, you, who, after the feasts of Venus and the cups of foolish Bacchus, lie slumbering heavily in your darkened chambers?

WINTER. Mine are the riches of the earth and the feasts of plenty. Sweet rest is mine; mine are the pleasant fires in the hall. All these pleasures are gone when the cuckoo comes, the traitor.

SPRING. True, but when the cuckoo comes, flowers spring from his mouth. He serves us with honey. Houses he builds, and teaches us to launch our ships upon the sea. The tender twig starts into life and the pleasant field is clothed with verdure at his coming.

WINTER. All these things are hateful to me, though they give you joy. Plenty of gold, plenty of victuals, plenty of rest—these are my joys.

SPRING. And what joys would you have, you sluggard, if Spring and Summer labored not for you?

WINTER. True. These are my slaves, and all they who labor, labor for me, their master.

SPRING. No. Poor and helpless as you are, you are master of none. You cannot even feed yourself, unless the cuckoo who comes shall be your almoner.

Then exulting sang Palaemon, the aged shepherd, and Daphnis, and all their company: "Say no more, Winter, you waster of wealth. Let the cuckoo come, the pleasant friend of the shepherd. The young lambs play on the hillsides. Now is there pasture for our flocks, and pleasant rest for the weary under the green trees. The milkmaid's pail overflows. Let our flocks salute the sun; for lo, the cuckoo comes, the welcome

guest. Come bird; all await thee, the earth, the sea, the very sky. Hail! Sweet bird, through all the ages hail to thee."

Palaemon and Daphnis, Venus and Bacchus, are mere conveniences of Latin verse. Behind them the native aspect of the northern climate and of northern activities is unmistakable. Now compare with the general form of Bede's eclogue the following paraphrase of a red Indian idyl:[1]

An old man sat alone in his lodge by the side of a frozen river. It was the close of winter, and his fire was almost out. He appeared very old and very desolate. His hair was white, and he trembled in every joint. Day after day passed in solitude, and he heard nothing save the sound of the tempest sweeping before it the new-fallen snow. One day, as his fire was just dying, a handsome youth entered his dwelling. The young man's cheeks were red; his eyes sparkled with life, and a smile played upon his lips. He walked with a light, quick step. His forehead was bound with a wreath of sweet grass instead of a warrior's frontlet, and he carried a bunch of flowers in his hand.

"Ah! my son," said the old man; "I am glad to see you. Come in. Come, tell me of your adventures and what strange lands you have seen. Let us pass the night together. I will tell you of my prowess and exploits, and what wonders I can perform. You shall do the same, and we will amuse ourselves."

He drew from his pouch an ancient, curiously wrought pipe and, filling it with tobacco, handed it to

[1] From Schoolcraft. But worked over in this case from the form given the fable in *The Indian Fairy Book*, published anonymously in New York in 1856.

his guest. When this ceremony was attended to, they began to speak.

OLD MAN. I blow my breath and the streams stand still. The water becomes as hard as stone.

YOUNG MAN. I breathe and flowers spring up all over the plains.

OLD MAN. I shake my locks and snow covers the land. The leaves fall from the trees at my command, and my breath blows them away. The birds rise from the water and fly to a distant land. The beasts hide themselves from the glance of my eye, and the very ground where I walk becomes as hard as flint.

YOUNG MAN. I nod my head and warm showers of soft rain fall upon the earth. The plants lift up their heads out of the ground, like eyes of children glistening with delight. My voice recalls the birds. The warmth of my breath unlocks the streams. Music fills the woods wherever I walk, and all nature welcomes my approach.

At length the sun began to rise. A gentle warmth came over the place. The tongue of the old man became silent. The robin and the blue-bird began to sing on the top of the lodge. The stream began to murmur by the door, and the fragrance of growing plants and flowers came softly on the breeze. Daybreak revealed to the young man the character of his host—none other than Peboan, the icy spirit of winter. As the sun rose, Peboan became smaller and smaller, and presently melted completely away. Nothing remained on the hearth where his lodge fire had been except the miskodeed,[1] a tiny white flower with a pink border, which the young man Seegwun, the spirit of spring, placed in the wreath on his brow as his first trophy in the north.

[1] *Claytonia Virginica* or *Caroliniana.*

Examples could be multiplied to show that human nature has never in any age needed a Boëthius to teach it the art of personification. What Boëthius did for the mediaeval period was to transmit to it a host of metrical forms, most of which were copied from Seneca's tragedies. Thus, even if there be little evidence of acquaintance with these tragedies on the part of any before the days of Nicholas Trivet,[1] still they had an indirect influence upon mediaeval Latin versification. There is no need in the present inquiry to reach back beyond Boëthius, since the tradition of classic times was continuous to his day, though meager. At the close of the mediaeval period Lydgate is found consulting Seneca for the story of Oedipus and for parts of his poem on Thebes. The reading of Seneca is the confessed starting-point of the first great English tragedy, Gorboduc, and it was with this play that Pope in his plan of a history of English poetry proposed to introduce a digression on the influence of Seneca.[2] Plautus may have been read, Terence certainly was, and was even acted. But with Seneca's tragedies, as far as present knowledge goes, it can only be said that learned men, like Peter of Blois, read them, but

[1] Warton, Vol. III, p. 76. An unfortunate misprint, rather unusual in Hazlitt's edition, makes Trivet's death occur in 1529 instead of 1329. Trivet's correspondence called the attention of learned men in Italy to the tragedies of Seneca. Fabricius, *Bibliotheca latina*, Vol. V, p. 127. See the works of Cloetta and Creizenach.

[2] Mitford, *The Poetical Works of Thomas Gray*, p. cxiv.

viewed them with indifference. One cause of this neglect was that the serious side of the drama was supplied by religion. Not only was the liturgy a drama in itself, but the new fashion of pious plays founded on scriptural narratives was more deeply thoughtful than the world now is apt to suppose. The prophets of the Old Testament had developed a philosophy of history which was a romance, an epic, and a drama all in one. It can still be read as an epic in Milton, Klopstock, or Du Bartas; as a romance in *The Prince of the House of David*, in *Ben-Hur*, or in *The Light of the World;* as a drama in *Christus Patiens*, in *Faust*, and in the plays of Oberammergau, not to mention the other versions innumerable that are in existence. It is an imaginative amplification of St. Paul's saying about the fulness of time. The unity of this epic, romance, or drama lies in the necessary continuity of man's struggle with sin. Its form is a trilogy: man's fall, his redemption, his compulsory appearance before God on the day of judgment. Thus the fully developed passion-play took in all humanity in all its varieties of virtue and vice, wit and stupidity, humor and solemnity, wisdom and folly; it went from good to bad, from the sublime to the ridiculous, from horse-play to prayer, revealing the whole individual life and the whole course of history. It was rude in its form, but wonderful in its scope, and the modern world has not yet got

beyond its horizon, with all the boasted culture of the present day. In truth, it was not merely a mediaeval conception. It was a variant of the plain thought of the New Testament, of the Hebrew prophets as they have always been read by Christians, of the fathers of the church, those who wrote in Greek as well as those who wrote in Latin.

While the plan of such a world-drama was obvious as soon as the religious play was invented, it is not at all certain that the Greeks of Byzantine times attempted to do more than to dramatize episodes of Scripture history. With them the church play remained, tacitly at least, a part of the religious service; hence it had to be short—an act, or a scene, rather than a complete performance. The play which had for its subject the legend of the Three Hebrew Children cast into the furnace by Nebuchadnezzar, seen by Brocquière[1] (1432) in the church of St. Sophia, must have been a detached episode of this sort. But the character of Romanus' little play of the Nativity, already mentioned, forecasts a larger scheme, like that of the German passion-play or the Townly Mysteries; and the paraphrase of the account of man's first transgression, by Ignatius, also previously alluded to, is remarkable especially for

[1] Wright, *Early Travels in Palestine*, p. 338, for a translation of Brocquière. The dramatic character of the hymns of Romanus can be pretty well ascertained from the selection given in Christ and Paranikas, *Anthologia Graeca carminum christianorum* pp. 131-39.

omitting the final curse upon the head of the serpent, as if that belonged to a different story. The author of this play was a deacon in the Church of St. Sophia in the eighth century. He therefore anticipated the Mysteries of the West by nearly four hundred years. His work he announced as written for the consolation or benefit of a friend in misfortune, and so he left in doubt whether his friend was to enjoy merely the dedication of a literary work or the income of a public performance. In contrast with the irregularity of popular religious dramas in the West, his little play is minutely subjected to metrical rules. The speeches of the dialogue, with a single exception are each just three verses long, and a verse is never broken between two interlocutors. Following the canons of mimography, the poet began with a prologue, in which, mourning over the fall of man, he described the miseries that were to follow, and thus introduced his first character, the serpent. This combination of narrative with dialogue long continued in both tragedy and comedy. It marks the growth of that species of art in which the play was recited by an expert declaimer, and was simultaneously or subsequently presented in dumb show by experts in pantomime. A reminiscence of this practice is shown in *Pericles Prince of Tyre*, where dumb show accompanies the recitations of Old Gower.

With the exception of the last speech in Ignatius' play, every speech is a stanza of three lines. The prologue consists of eighteen such stanzas; while the closing speech, that of the Deity expelling Adam and Eve from the Garden, lacks one line of making three tristichs, and the defect seems to be intentional.[1]

II

In the struggles of the first parents of humanity, when the sly serpent wove, by means of pleasure, temptations of old, and in the curse which they brought upon nature by yielding to their wily and inveterate foe, mayst thou see thine own destiny, involved in similar contests. For the evil one, seeing that the heavenly order, of which he himself once formed a part, was now extended throughout the universe, separating earth and sky, ranging the stars, evolving the elements and bringing forth life in all kinds, above all the creation of a being in the image of God, was moved by intolerable malice to strive for the expulsion of man from the Eden in which he was placed—Eden, the wonder of the East with its four rivers and its fertility graced by every beautiful plant and the fruits of every clime. To Eden comes the roving tempter,

[1] Boissonade, *Anecdota Graeca*, Vol. I, pp. 437 f. Krumbacher, *Geschichte der byzantinischen Litteratur*, p. 348, insists that the piece could never have had a public presentation, least of all in St. Sophia. One objection to it is that Adam and Eve must have been naked. But as is well known this was no obstacle in the West. The Byzantines knew all about what are now called "tights" on the stage.

and, cunningly laying siege to the weaker nature of Eve, urges her to taste of the forbidden tree, notwithstanding the warning of the Almighty. To her comes the serpent, raising his crest and saying:

OPHIS. What, then, woman, did the Creator say? Not to touch this plant only, lest ye become gods? 'Surely he said this in envy.

EVE. He said that of every tree we were to eat. But of this tree we were to avoid even the taste, lest we procure for ourselves death instead of nourishment.

OPHIS. And do you believe that? For He knew that, if you were to taste this fruit, you would become clear-sighted as gods.

EVE. Hast thou been with Adam, my man and my master; or, impudent, camest thou to me first? Thou knowest I was created second to him.

OPHIS. Adam has no will of his own. He will follow thy words, if thou advisest; and will eat, if thou eatest.

EVE. Thou comest to me as if in fear, and with wiles wouldst prevail on me. But suppose he eats this, there will be all the rest for me.

OPHIS. Trouble not the man. First try; first eat. Thus wilt thou win easily, for thou art woman.

EVE. Thou hast prevailed on me to eat and to persuade my husband to eat. But, friend, pledge me that what thou hast promised shall be fulfilled.

OPHIS. Be not slow to act, if thou expectest swift fulfilment. Delay gathers little favor.

EVE. Man, how sweet is the fruit of this tree. Take, eat, and become a god.

ADAM. Divine the gift offered by a friend. But how

will taste make one a god? For he is no god who requires food.

EVE. Seekest thou a better thing than knowledge? Eat of this, and thou shalt know all the bounds of good and evil.

ADAM. Who dare pass the bounds fixed by the Creator? In rashness hast thou stolen this fruit!

EVE. Thou hast the means of moving the bounds. Upon me be the blame. I will take all the penalty.

ADAM. Lo, woman, I have eaten, and what I have learned is my own misery.

EVE. And I, too, writhe with pain, misled by the wicked serpent.

ADAM. Alas, woman, look! We are naked. How shall we hide our shame? Where is there covering of modesty?

EVE. In these rough fig leaves, see, we will clothe ourselves. Rough will life be to us henceforth.

ADAM. Too late thou hast learned, to no profit, the terror of sin and pain.

EVE. I know, myself misled, that I confused thy wits and proved myself the cause of all corruption.

ADAM. Woman, hearest thou not the voice of God? How I dread his justice for that which is done.

EVE. I hear his footsteps. How frightful the thunder! Friend, let us conceal ourselves.

ADAM. Where can I hide? No place is without God. But follow me, woman.

THEOS. Adam, first of created beings, where art thou? What is the change that hath come over thee?

ADAM. In my nakedness I was afraid at the noise of thy feet; and at the sound of thy voice, fear bound me hand and foot.

THEOS. Wretch, who told thee thou wert naked? Or hast thou touched that which it was unlawful for thee to approach?

ADAM. I trusted the woman whom thou gavest me, and was persuaded by her soft speech to eat of the fruit forbidden.

THEOS. O thou! weaker than woman, thou shalt till amid the springing thorns, with sighs and pain and the sweat of thy brow. And thou, woman, shalt suffer in childbirth. Ye both shall live in toil and care till ye return to the earth, whence ye came.

III

Observe that the curse on the serpent and the blessing on the future offspring of the woman, the most significant parts of the original legend, are omitted. The inference seems to be that these are reserved to another act, and that composition in any part of this drama was restricted thus to well-defined traditional limits. Any poet might have taken up the work where Ignatius left off, and obeying the same rules, could have added another act or completed the whole argument of the fall, the redemption and the judgment without a lost or superfluous link. Another significant feature of this play is the long prologue, with a dialogue in which the speeches are of exactly equal length. It is not to be supposed that the piece was sung, though it may have been chanted like a canon in the regular service of the Eastern church. The

careful admeasurement of the parts was undoubtedly for the convenience of performers. Unfortunately, Brocquière gave no account of the Mystery which he saw played at Constantinople. But there is reason to suppose that a poem of this kind was often read by its author or by a trained rhetorician, and, if acting were deemed necessary, it was given in pantomime; either with the reading, as is frequently the case with modern *tableaux vivants*, or as an accompaniment, like a ballet set to elaborate music. The convenience of uniform versification and stanzas of equal length in such a case is obvious. A hidden prompter, beating time to the chant, gives each player his cue at exactly the proper moment; or, even without a prompter, each player, conscious of the rhythm, anticipates his turn. Warton thought this pantomime incredible, though it is presupposed in the familiar anecdote of Roscius, and is actually described with lifelike fidelity in Lydgate's *Troy Book*. Telling of the performance of a tragedy in the theater of Troy, the poet says:[1]

> All this was tolde and red of the poet.
> And whyle that he in the pulpet stode
> With deadly face all devoyde of blode,
> Singing his diteis with muses all-to-rent;
> Amyd the theatre shrowded in a tent,

[1] Lydgate, *Troy Book*, l, ii, cap. x; Hazlitt's *Warton*, Vol. III, p. 90. Compare the remarks of Pietro di Dante in the preface to his commentary on the works of his father: "Libri titulus est Comoedia Dantis

There came out men gastfull of their cheres,
Disfygured their faces with viseres,
Playing by sygnes in the peoples syght
That the poet songe hath on height:
So that there was no maner discordaunce,
Atweene his ditees and their countenance,
For lyke as he alofte dyd expresse
Words of joye or of heavinesse,
So craftely they could them transfygure.

Lydgate added that plays and tragedies were acted in the Trojan theater every year in the months of April and May. Byzantine history and customs furnished the ideas which the mediaeval West had of ancient Greece. Shakespeare made Theseus duke of Athens because within recent memory there had been dukes of Athens. So Lydgate transferred to Troy what he had learned of Greek cities in the times just before the Ottoman conquest. He put his theatrical festival in the spring, and in the spring such performances were still kept up even in Turkish Constantinople by certain trade-guilds as late as the eighteenth century. His performers

Allegheris, et quare sic vocetur, adverte. Antiquitus in theatro, quod erat area semicircularis, et in eius medio erat domuncula, quae scaena dicebatur, in qua erat pulpitum, et super id ascendebat poeta ut cantor, et sua carmina ut cantiones recitabat. Extra vero mimi, id est, joculatores, carminum pronuntiationem gestu corporis effigiantes per adaptationem ad quem libet ex cuius persona ipse poeta loquebatur; unde cum loquebatur, pone de Junone conquerente de Herculo privigno suo, mimi, sicut recitabant, ita effigiabant Junonem invocare furias infernales ad infestandum ipsum Herculem; et si tale pulpitum seu domunculum ascendebat poeta qui de more villico caueret, talis cantus dicebatur comoedia." (Quoted by Cloetta, *Beiträge zur Litteraturgeschichte des Mittelalters und der Renaissance*, Vol. I, p. 38.

wore masks, and this was characteristic of the Byzantine stage until the close of the fourteenth century, if not later. To divide the art of acting between the reciter and the dumb show man would not be possible now, perhaps; but to the Greeks, after they had minutely specialized the branches of rhetoric, it seemed natural to cultivate each by itself, and to look upon the mastery of motion and gesture as quite distinct from the mastery of language and elocution. True, as Choricius said, the mime was expected to be trained in voice and utterance as well as in action. But that does not preclude the specialists in pantomime. Lydgate goes into detail that he would hardly have imagined on the basis of what he could learn from books about the ancient theater. His details are very circumstantial, with an air of reality. He either drew upon his imagination, or he wrote what he had heard. Upon reading his poetry in general, few will care to refer to his imagination. He must then have described what somebody had seen. We may safely infer that his verses are an explicit account at second hand of a kind of performance well known in Byzantium, and an account highly valuable because almost unique.

This leads to another consideration respecting the mediaeval lack of interest in the tragedies of Seneca. The play was never popular even in the days of Plautus and Terence. Comedy, above the

rank of farce, ceased to draw before the fall of the Republic. Latin tragedy[1] had little vogue after the time of Accius, and the Roman historical play, though it survived, was rarely attempted. Thus the drama early became at Rome a mere exercise. Cicero, Caesar, and other distinguished men wrote tragedies, but with no thought of the stage. Seneca's tragedies, in spite of the influence they have had in modern times, were probably never acted. They may have been read or declaimed, as were the *Silvae* of Statius. The reading may have been illustrated with pantomime before an invited assembly. But they never gained the renown which Terence's comedies won, confessedly with difficulty, from public exhibition. This indifference of the Romans to a kind of literature which was so highly attractive to the Greeks, and which ceaselessly renews its charm in modern times, is no doubt partly accounted for by the fondness of the ancient Italians for spectacles and games and the cruel sports of the arena. But behind that there may be also another reason in the dramatic characteristics of the people. Why is modern Italian tragedy ranting and exaggerated, why is Italian comedy farcical, if not in the hope of outdoing what the Italians do so well in their ordinary conversation, upon the mere impulse of the moment? As for the ancients, Sir Henry Maine pointed out

[1] Crutwell, *History of Roman Literature*, p. 67.

more than once that the Roman trial at law was a little drama.[1] And the proper stage play of the Romans was that which was developed under various forms and different names from the traditional festivities of the countryside. This sort of play was even domesticated in the mixed society of Constantinople. According to the testimony of the historian John Lydus, the *Atellana, palliata, togata tabernaria, rhinthonice, planipedaria*—in fact all the popular stage performances of Rome—continued to flourish at the capital of the East along with the more polished Greek drama until the reign of Justinian; while Manuel Phile, a Greek poet contemporary with Dante, indicated that the mimes at the close of the thirteenth century still gave the same kind of entertainment as that which Chrysostom censured a thousand years before.

Nevertheless, a change had taken place. While the different classes of plays above named retained their respective characters and an unchanged cast, even to the traditional names of the personages, and a hypothesis for each kind of play distinct from those of all other kinds, but varied in itself

[1] Maine, *Ancient Law*, p. 268. "An ancient Conveyance was not written but acted." He cites Plautus, *Pseudolus*, Act I, sc. 1; Act IV, sc. 6; *Trinummus*, Act V, sc. 2, to show how accurately the necessary dialogue of a verbal contract fitted the hand of the playwright. After describing the process and quoting the dialogue of the *Legis actio*, he adds (p. 363): "It is impossible to refuse assent to the suggestion of those who see in it a dramatization of the origin of justice." The page numbers are those of the third American edition.

from age to age only in minor details, the performance had fallen, for the time at least, from the hands of peasants and artisans into those of the professional mimes and thence to the pantomimes. The modern Punch and Judy show is a manifest relic of the pantomimic play—that is, outside of Italy, while in Italy it has retained or, more accurately, has recovered, the character of a play by mimes. The result in the later ages of the empire was that all the ancient Roman popular plays were staged alike, and yet no spectator was for a moment at a loss upon the point whether the piece he witnessed was an Atellan or satyric farce, a togate or palliate play, *tabernaria* or *planipedaria*.

The most systematic description of these various kinds of plays is that of Diomedes,[1] a grammarian who appears to have written at a date not later than the fourth century. To him we owe the information that Roscius was the first to introduce a mask on the Roman stage. From his definition of tragedy and comedy, omitting, as he did, what everybody could then see for himself, Dante, Chaucer, and Lydgate may have drawn their defective interpretation of these words. According to him there were, from the beginning of literary effort at Rome, two great classes of dramas, the *togatae*, and the *palliatae*. The former were played by

[1] Putschius, *Grammaticae Latinae auctores antiqui*, cols. 487 f. This book is printed in double columns, and each column is numbered instead of the page. No later edition of the grammarians is at hand.

actors in Roman costume; the latter required Greek dress. All the plays of Plautus are *palliatae.* The *togatae* were differentiated gradually by the themes which they treated. Naevius created the history, in which the deeds, real or legendary, of distinguished Romans were represented. Plays of this sort were produced, frequently at first, more and more rarely afterward, until very late times. They were not uniformly tragical, like the Greek histories of the Atridae and other families of the mythical period, but more like the histories of the English stage. As the toga was worn by Romans of no renown as well as by those of distinction, there grew up in Italy a kind of comedy copied after Greek models, but national or local in purpose, manners and dress; and this was called the *comoedia togata.* As a literary product, apart from popular improvisation, this national comedy, *comoedia togata*, and *togata tabernaria*, seems to be subsequent to the days of Terence. Titinius, the foremost playwright in this field, is said to have taken Attic comedies as the basis of his works, changing scenes, costumes, and the atmosphere of his pieces from Greek to Italian. Thus he succeeded in depicting the town-life of southern Latium in a grossly indecent but highly humorous fashion. Instead of Greek names, Latin ones were introduced, as Brutus, Decius, Marcellus, and the like. Arguing from the analogy of other dramatic

forms yet to be mentioned, it may be inferred that each of these names was restricted to a particular phase of comedy. Brutus may have been the hero of plays in which an apparent simpleton suddenly becomes a man of action and leadership, while Decius was probably a name assigned to uxorious old men fooled by their young wives. It is a plausible supposition that the legend of the first Brutus, the conqueror of the Tarquins, was embodied in a traditional rude play of the country people. But the name itself suggests a character of real or simulated stupidity.

The third great species of Latin play was the Atellane, so called because it originated at the small Oscan town of Atella, now San Arpino, not far from the still existing Acerra, which is said to have been the first home of the Neapolitan Pulcinella. In the *Atellanae* plot and dialogue were jocular as with the *satyrae* of the Greek stage. Satyr plays among the Greeks, often written by the tragic poets for after-pieces, introduced satyrs or any other kind of personage suitable to coarse and amusing situations and speeches. They were a part, but a part only, in the history of Latin satire, which for some of its peculiarities looks back to an antique improvised poesy called *fescenninae*, the origin of which is credited to Etruria. Two ribald verse-makers ridiculed each other in alternate rhythmical speeches—a custom that seems

to have descended to the troubadours of Provence; or a single poet amused his audience by a string of rhythmical jokes at the expense now of one bystander, now of another. The *satyrae*, acted on the Roman stage from early in the fourth century before Christ, were merely a more polished and studied performance of this kind. Their native form must have felt the influence of the Greek satyric drama very early—that is, at a time when the Greek name "Pyrrhus" was still pronounced "Burrus" by the Romans.

The Latin *Atellanae* differed from the Greek *satyrae* in this, that the *satyrae* as known to the Romans had for the principal characters such names as Autolycus and Burrus, while in the *Atellanae* the persons were Maccus, Bucco, Pappus, and Dorsenus. Maccus was, according to the purpose of the particular piece, Maccus Miles, Maccus Virgo, Maccus Sequester, Maccus Copo, or Maccus Exsul, and, sometimes doubled, he and his counterpart became Macci Gemini. Perhaps these last furnished the suggestion for Plautus' famous play out of which grew Shakespeare's *Comedy of Errors*. Maccus was a character very nearly equivalent to the modern Italian Pulcinella. The name is probably of Greek derivation, corresponding to the feminine μακκώ, "a stupid woman." Bucco, "Big Mouth;" Pappus, Pappus Agricolo, "Pap" or "Daddy Hayseed;"

Dorsenus, literally "Backman," a pickpocket, suggest the character of the play in which they took part. Maccus was doubtless the most ancient figure in the Atellan farces, dating from the times when these were mere games of the Oscan country folk. He seems to have been made up with an immense head, and, like the modern clown, came in for all the hard knocks, but with the universal favor of the spectators. In a small bronze statue of a Maccus discovered at Rome in 1727, but known now only by engravings, are to be seen the deformed, exaggerated nose and staring eyes so familiar on the puppet stage. No doubt, a fairly complete idea of the ancient Maccus could be obtained by collating the Italian Pulcinella with its derivatives in other countries. The English Punch dates from the Restoration and is of French parentage. The French Polichinelle became known a little before 1650—that is, as one might guess, in the days of that facsimile of the missing link, Cyrano de Bergerac. In fact, Cyrano killed the ape that had been trained to act in the first French puppet show, that of Gian Briocci, and excused himself for the crazy and cruel freak on the plea that the animal had insulted him. In spite of the fact that in both England and France the original pantomime has been degraded to the motion of inanimate figures, yet each has preserved some traits of the old Roman farce which are no longer known in Italy. In

Sicily and Calabria the name is applied to the mummers of the carnival, whose performances are called *Pulcinellate*, and these are, perhaps, a closer reproduction of the original Atellan farces than any more regular form of dramatic entertainment could be. The players sing and dance before the shops, begging viands for their banquet in the interest of Pulcinella, who may have been originally a fowl, as the name indicates, like the wren in Ireland, or the swallow in ancient Greece. The Greek-swallow-song suggests plainly the pantomime that accompanied it:

Come, swallow, come; bring fine seasons, beautiful times, upon thy white belly, upon thy black back. Roll out the fruit-cake from the rich house, and of wine a bowl, and of cheese a basket; nor will the swallow reject loaves or pulse-bread. Shall we go away, or shall we receive a gift? If you give anything, or if you give nothing, we shall be no hindrance to you. Shall we bear away the door or that which is upon the door, or the woman who sits within. She is a little body; we could easily carry her away. If thou carriest anything, let me carry something great. Open, open the door to the swallow, for we are not old, we are children.[1]

IV

In the Neapolitan play, Pulcinella is a country bumpkin, who, upon seeing the city for the first time, falls into all sorts of difficulties. His obstreperousness gets him into a madhouse, where

[1] Bergk, *Anthologia Graeca*, p. 537.

he is treated to all the violence formerly universal in the treatment of insane patients; but at last, turning the tables on his captors, he gives back to the doctor and the keepers all that he has received and more. After various adventures, he finds himself in love with a young person who is under the care of an old maiden aunt. His proposals are taken by this relic of antiquity to herself, and, when her mind is disabused, all the resources of the stage are taxed to meet the situation. Pulcinella returns to his country home with a stock of dear-bought wisdom, enough to last him the rest of his life. His subsequent career belongs, as we know, to the English Punch, who is nothing if not a family man.

While the intimate relationship between Maccus and Pulcinella is generally accepted, yet it lacks the evidence that might be drawn from an identity of names. The characters in the Graeco-Latin satyric drama, namely Autolycus and Pyrrhus, seem to have had better luck in this respect. The original Autolycus[1] was reputed the son of Hermes by Chione, daughter of Daedalion, or by Stilbe or Telange, daughter of Eosphorus. Of course, the genealogy of all numina, whatever their rank in mythology, is purely nominal, for their descent is an etymological process. But here the doctors differ, since Autolycus may mean "Wolf-self" or

[1] Hyginus, *Fab.*, CCI; Van Staveren, *Auctores mythographi Latini*, pp. 332 f.

"Light-Self;" while similar ambiguities embarrass the interpretation of other names in the series. The thievishness attributed to the character is in harmony with either derivation of the name; though, after the stigma of cattle-stealing was once fixed, wolfishness would be the natural inference. The first dramatic myth in which Autolycus figured was his contest with Sisyphus. He then dwelt on Parnassus, and, when he lifted a herd of horses or cattle, it was his practice to deface the owner's mark so that identification was impossible. Sisyphus observed that his own herd continually decreased, while that of Autolycus grew in numbers daily. So he marked all the cattle he could find secretly in the hoof. Then he dropped in on Autolycus one day, and in a twinkling, by the mere display of his new mark, stripped him of all his ill-gotten wealth. Autolycus, to conceal his trepidation, was excessively hospitable, and Sisyphus took a mean advantage of his daughter Anticlea. Before her misfortune came to light she was married off to Laertes, and her astute son Ulysses owed his cunning, not to his putative father, but to his real one. Ovid, of course, appropriated the story of Autolycus as part of the eleventh of his *Metamorphoses*, and wrote what could have served as a prologue to any play in which Autolycus was made to figure.[1]

[1] Ovid., *Met.*, xi, 294-317.

It seems as though Shakespeare must have had this passage in mind when he introduced the character of Autolycus into *A Winter's Tale;* it is even possible that he had seen one of the very plays of the old Graeco-Latin satyric type, in which Autolycus figured, and that his own play is to that extent the working-out of antique reminiscence.

I

[*Enter Autolycus singing*]

When daffodils begin to pear,
With heigh! the doxy over the dale,
Why, then comes in the sweet o'the year;
For the red blood reigns in the winter's pale.

The white sheet bleaching on the hedge,
With heigh! the sweet birds, O, how they sing!
Doth set my pugging tooth on edge;
For a quart of ale is a dish for a king.

The lark that tirra-lirra chants,
With heigh, with heigh! the thrush and the jay,
Are summer songs for me and my aunts,
As we lie tumbling in the hay.

I have served a prince in my time, and wore three-pile; but now I am out of service:

But shall I go mourn for that, my dear?
The pale moon shines by night:
And when I wander here and there,
I then do most go right.

If tinkers may have leave to live,
And bear the sow-skin budget,
Then my account I well may give,
And in the stocks avouch it.

My traffic is sheets; when the kite builds, look to lesser linen. My father named me Autolycus; who being, as I am, littered under Mercury, was likewise a snapper-up of unconsidered trifles. With die and drab I purchased this caparison; and my revenue is the silly cheat: gallows and knock are too powerful on the highway; beating and hanging are terrors to me; for the life to come, I sleep out the thought of it.—A prize, a prize!

Enter Clown, in this case a mere rustic

CLOWN. Let me see: Every 'leven wether—tods; every tod yields—pound and odd shilling! fifteen hundred shorn,—what comes the wool to?

AUTOLYCUS [*aside*]. If the springe hold, the cock's mine.

CLOWN. I cannot do't without counters. Let me see: what am I to buy for our sheep-shearing feast? "Three pound of sugar; five pounds of currants; rice." —What will this sister of mine do with rice? But my father hath made her mistress of the feast, and she lays it on. She hath made me four and twenty nosegays for the shearers,—three men song men all, and very good ones; but they are most of them means and bases; but one Puritan amongst them, and he sings psalms to hornpipes. I must have saffron to color the warden pies; mace, dates,—none; "a race or two of ginger,"—but that I may beg; "four pound of prunes, and as many of raisins o'the sun."

AUTOLYCUS. O, that ever I was born! [*grovelling on the ground.*]

CLOWN. I'the name of me!

AUTOLYCUS. O, help me, help me! pluck but off these rags; and then death, death!

CLOWN. Alack, poor soul! thou hast need of more rags to lay on, rather than to leave these off.

AUTOLYCUS. O, sir, the loathsomeness of them offends me more than the stripes I have received, which are mighty ones and millions.

CLOWN. Alas, poor man, a million of beating may come to a great matter.

AUTOLYCUS. I am robbed, sir, and beaten; my money and apparel ta'en from me, and these detestable things put upon me.

CLOWN. What, by a horseman or a footman?

AUTOLYCUS. A footman, sweet sir, a footman.

CLOWN. Indeed, he should be a foot-man, by the garments he hath left with thee: if this be a horseman's coat, it hath seen very hot service. Lend me thy hand, I'll help thee up: come, lend me thy hand. [*Helping him up.*]

AUTOLYCUS. O, good sir, tenderly, O!

CLOWN. Alas, poor soul!

AUTOLYCUS. O, good sir! softly, good sir! I fear, sir, my shoulderblade is out.

CLOWN. How now! canst stand?

AUTOLYCUS. Softly, dear sir; [*Picks his pocket.*] good sir, softly. You ha' done me a charitable office.

CLOWN. Dost lack any money? I have a little money for thee?

AUTOLYCUS. No, good sweet sir; no, I beseech you, sir. I have a kinsman not past three quarters of a mile hence, unto whom I was going; I shall there have money, or anything I want: offer me no money, I pray you, that kills my heart.

CLOWN. What manner of fellow was he that robbed you?

AUTOLYCUS. A fellow, sir, that I have known to go about with troll-my-dames: I knew him once a servant of the Prince; I cannot tell, good sir, for which of his

virtues it was, but he was certainly whipped out of the court.

CLOWN. His vices, you would say; there's no virtue whipped out of the court: they cherish it, to make it stay there; and yet it will no more but abide.

AUTOLYCUS. Vices, I would say, sir. I know this man well: he hath been since an ape-bearer; then a process-server, a bailiff; then he compassed motion of the prodigal son and married a tinker's wife within a mile of where my land and living lies: and having flown over many knavish professions, he settled only in rogue: Some call him Autolycus.

CLOWN. Out upon him! Prig, for my life, prig; he haunts wakes, fairs, and bear-baitings.

AUTOLYCUS. Very true, sir; he, sir, he; that's the rogue that put me into this apparel.

CLOWN. Not a more cowardly rogue in all Bohemia: if you had but looked big and spit at him, he'd have run.

AUTOLYCUS. I must confess to you, sir, I am no fighter: I am false of heart that way: and that he knew, I warrant him.

CLOWN. How do you now?

AUTOLYCUS. Sweet sir, much better than I was; I can stand and walk: I will even take my leave of you, and pace softly toward my kinsman's.

CLOWN. Shall I bring thee on the way?

AUTOLYCUS. No, good-faced sir; no, sweet sir.

CLOWN. Then, fare thee well, I must go buy spices for our sheep-shearing.

AUTOLYCUS. Prosper you, sweet sir! [*Exit Clown.*] —Your purse is not hot enough to purchase your spice. I'll be with you at your sheep-shearing, too. If I make not this cheat bring out another, and the shearers prove

sheep, let me be unrolled, and my name put in the book of virtue. [*Sings.*]

Jog on, jog on, the foot-path way,
And merrily hent the stile–a
A merry heart goes all the day,
Your sad tires in the mile–a.

II

SERVANT. O, master, if you did but hear the peddler at the door, you would never dance again after a tabor and pipe; no, the bagpipe could not move you: he sings several times faster than you'll tell money, he utters them as he had eaten ballads, and all men's ears grew to his tunes.

CLOWN. He could never come better: he shall come in; I love a ballad but even too well; if it be doleful matter merrily set down, or a very pleasant thing indeed and sung lamentably.

SERVANT. He hath songs for man or woman, of all sizes; no milliner can so fit his customers; he has the prettiest love-songs for maids; so without bawdry, which is strange; with such delicate burden of 'dildos' and 'fadings,' 'jump her and thump her,' and where some stretch-mouthed rascal would, as it were, mean mischief, and break a foul gap in the matter, he makes the maid to answer, 'Whoop, do me no harm, good man;' puts him off, slights him with, 'Whoop, do me no harm, good man.'

CLOWN. Believe me, thou talkest of an admirable conceited fellow. Has he any unbraided wares?

SERVANT. He hath ribands of all the colors i'the rainbow: points, more than all the lawyers in Bohemia can learnedly handle, though they come to him by the gross; inkles, cadisses, cambrics, lawns: why, he sings

them over, as they were gods and goddesses; you would think a smock were a she-angel, he so chants to the sleeve-band, and the work about the square on't.

CLOWN. Pr'ythee, bring him in; and let him approach singing.

[*Enter Autolycus singing.*]

Lawn as white as driven snow;
Cyprus black as e'er was crow;
Gloves as sweet as damask roses;
Masks for faces and for noses;
Bugle-bracelet, necklace-amber,
Perfume for a lady's chamber;
Golden quoifs and stomachers,
For my lads to give their dears;
Pins and poking-sticks of steel,
What maids lack from head to heel:
Come, buy of me, come; come, buy, come, buy;
Buy, lads, or else your lasses cry;
Come, buy.

CLOWN. If I were not in love with Mopsa, thou shouldst take no money of me; but being enthralled as I am, it will also be the bondage of certain ribands and gloves.

MOPSA. I was promised them against the feast; but they come not too late now.

DORCAS. He hath promised you more than that or there be liars.

MOPSA. He hath paid you all he promised you; maybe he has paid you more; which will shame you to give him back again.

CLOWN. Is there no manners left among maids? Will they wear their plackets—where they should bear their faces? Is there not milking-time—when you are

going to bed—or kiln-hole to whistle off these secrets, but you must be tittle-tattling before all our guests? 'Tis well, they are whispering. Clamour your tongues, and not a word more.

MOPSA. I have done. Come, you promised me a tawdry lace and a pair of sweet gloves.

CLOWN. Have I not told thee, how I was cozened by the way and lost all my money?

AUTOLYCUS. And, indeed, sir, there are cozeners abroad, and it behoves men to be wary.

CLOWN. Fear not thou, man, thou shalt lose nothing here.

AUTOLYCUS. I hope so, sir; for I have about me many parcels of charge.

CLOWN. What hast here? ballads?

MOPSA. Pray now, buy some: I love a ballad in print a'-life; for then we are sure they are true.

AUTOLYCUS. Here's one to a very doleful tune. How a usurer's wife was brought to bed of twenty money-bags at a burden; and how she longed to eat adders' heads and toads carbonadoed.

MOPSA. Is it true, think you?

AUTOLYCUS. Very true; and but a month old.

DORCAS. Bless me from marrying a usurer.

AUTOLYCUS. Here's the midwife's name to it, one Mistress Taleporter, and five or six honest wives that were present. Why should I carry lies abroad?

MOPSA. Pray you, now, buy it.

CLOWN. Come on, lay it by: and let's first see more ballads; we'll buy the other things anon.

AUTOLYCUS. Here's another ballad of a fish, that appeared on the coast, on Wednesday the fourscore of April, forty thousand fathom above the water and sung this ballad against the hard hearts of maids: it was

thought she was a woman, and was turned into a cold fish, for she would not exchange flesh with one that loved her: the ballad is very pitiful and as true.

DORCAS. Is it true?

AUTOLYCUS. Five justices' hands at it, and witnesses more than my pack will hold.

CLOWN. Lay it by too: another.

AUTOLYCUS. This is a merry ballad, but a very pretty one.

MOPSA. Let's have some merry ones.

AUTOLYCUS. Why, this is a passing merry one and goes to the tune of 'Two maids wooing a man': there's scarce a maid westward but she sings it; 'tis in request, I can tell you.

MOPSA. We can both sing it: if thou'lt bear a part, thou shalt hear; 'tis in three parts.

DORCAS. We had the tune on't a month ago.

AUTOLYCUS. I can bear my part; you must know 'tis my occupation: have at it with you.

SONG

AUTOLYCUS. Get you hence, for I must go
Where it fits you not to know.
DORCAS. Whither?
MOPSA. O Whither?
DORCAS. Whither?
MOPSA. It becomes thy oath full well,
Thou to me thy secrets tell.
DORCAS. Me too, let me go thither.
MOPSA. Or thou go'st to the grange or mill:
DORCAS. If to either, thou dost ill.
AUTOLYCUS. Neither.
DORCAS. What neither?
AUTOLYCUS. Neither.

DORCAS. Thou hast sworn my love to be;
MOPSA. Thou hast sworn it more to me;
Then whither go'st, say whither.

CLOWN. We'll have this song out anon by ourselves. Come, bring away thy pack after me.—Wenches, I'll forgive you both.—Peddler, let's have the first choice. Follow me, girls.

AUTOLYCUS [*aside*]. And you shall pay me well for 'em. [*Singing*]

Will you buy any tape,
Or lace for your cape,
My dainty duck, my dear-a,
Any silk, any thread,
Any toys for your head,
Of the new'st and fin'st, fin'st wear-a?
Come to the peddlar
Money's a medler
That doth utter all men's ware-a

[*Exit with Dorcas and Mopsa.*]

III

AUTOLYCUS. Ha, ha! what a fool honesty is! and Trust, his sworn brother, a very simple gentleman! I have sold all my trumpery; not a counterfeit stone, not a riband, glass, pomander, brooch, table-book; ballad, knife, tape, glove, shoe-tie, bracelet, horn-ring, to keep my pack from fasting; they throng who should buy first, as if my trinkets had been hallowed, and brought a benediction to the buyer: by which means I saw whose purse was best in picture; and what I saw, to my good use I remembered. My clown (who wants but something to be a reasonable man) grew so in love with the wenches' song, that he would not stir his petitoes till

he had both tune and words; which so drew the rest of the herd to me, that all their senses stuck in their ears: you might have pinched a placket, it was senseless; 'twas nothing to geld a codpiece of a purse: I would have filed keys off, that hung in chains: no hearing, no feeling, but my sir's song, and admiring the nothing of it. So that, in this time of lethargy, I picked and cut most of their festival purses; and had not the old man come in with a whoo-bub . . . . and scared my choughs from the chaff, I had not left a purse alive in the whole army.

V

To this point the whole episode of Autolycus is a mere interlude (a favorite device of Greek dramatists after the Renaissance, by the way), having nothing to do with the main plot, and it is obviously complete. In the remaining two scenes in which the sharper figures he is instrumental in working out the play to its due conclusion. The incident of a rogue changing clothes with a runaway prince and aiding the elopement of a pair of lovers is not unbefitting the son of Hermes. Probably an affair of stolen love, often coarse and obscene, but sometimes, as in this case, refined and beautiful, in which Autolycus was victim or tool, never principal, formed part of the story from the very origin of the Sisyphean legend already narrated. The principal objection to the thought of connecting Shakespeare's Autolycus with the Graeco-Roman satyric drama is the lack of inter-

mediate literature to form a link. But in other episodes of *A Winter's Tale* Shakespeare confesses his borrowings, as when he makes Perdita say in the midst of her pretty fooling with flowers at the shearing feast:

> Methinks I play as I have seen them do
> In Whitsun pastorals.

And the drama as a whole, in spite of its harmless anachronisms, belongs in spirit to classical, one had almost said, to pre-classical, times. But by the example of another form of satyric drama, that associated with the name of Pyrrhus, it can be shown that the ancient popular stage methods really descended through mediaeval times, and even the line of descent may be traced, sometimes in a pure satyric play, sometimes in a complex of the *satyra* with the *tabernaria*. This contaminative process was known to ancient times. The *Rhinthonica*, so-called from its inventor Rhinthon, was otherwise known as "comedy-tragedy"—a phrase known to Shakespeare, and preferred by him in the stage technicalities of Polonius to the Italian "tragicomedy," a word which ought to mean the the same, but does not. The *planipedaria* also, the distinctive characteristic of which in early times was the bare feet of the actors, was lost in the Greek *soccus*, and the stage dress became in general Greek, like that of the higher comedy, though the plot was always the same—that of a

husband outwitted by his wife. When two kinds of plays were thus fused into one, it is natural to suppose that the names of the characters peculiar to each would be associated in the cast of the combination. The names which were applied to the characters in the *Attelanae* and *satyrae*, according to Diomedes, have been given. In addition he says that in Roman tragedy there were such names as Dulorestes, Chryses, and the like. In the *praetextata*, or histories, the names used were such as Brutus, Decius, and Marcellus. These meant simply that the characters represented people of rank or official position. The tendency to follow a rule in this matter was much greater than at the present day. Even in the plays of Plautus and Terence the same names were apt to recur again and again in various casts. In modern times Punch and the pantomime are noted for like uniformity, and there is in the modern popular rustic-comedy a superfluity of uncles and aunts—titles that are equivalent to names. The lack of variety in theatrical performances is such that names could evidently be repeated to a much greater extent than they are. In ancient times the system was carried far. Just as we know now, when we hear of Harlequin,[1]

[1] Sathas, 'Ιστορικὸν Δοκίμιον περὶ τοῦ Θεάτρου καὶ τῆς Μουσικῆς τῶν Βυζαντινῶν ἤτοι εἰσαγωγὴ εἰς τὸ Κρητικὸν Θέατρον, p. κδ', has an eccentric idea as to the derivation of this word. He says: τοιοῦτος δὲ εἶναι καὶ ὁ μέσου λατινισμοῦ γελωτοποιὸς 'Αρλεκῖνος, κατὰ παραφθορὰν πιθανῶς τοῦ τῶν

what sort of performance we are to witness, so the ancients, from the names of Autolycus, Burrus or Pyrrhus, Maccus, Brutus, Decius, Marcellus, Dulorestes, anticipated at once the form of the drama to come and were able to give a probable guess even as to the details of the plot. Autolycus suggested incidents similar to those in *A Winter's Tale;* Brutus, a kind of play, as the name indicates, in which the simpleton turns out a hero; and Burrus, or as the name was afterward written, Pyrrhus, a kind of which there still exist gross mediaeval paraphrases, most of which seem to go back for origin or parallel to that elaborate joke of irreverent Hindoos, the Fifth Veda.[1] If names

Βυζαντινῶν 'Αρμενίου ἢ ἐπὶ τὸ λατινικώτερον 'Αρμενίνου; to which he adds the following note: 'Η διακωμῴδησις τῶν 'Αράβων καὶ 'Αρμενίων ἦν τὸ κύριον ἔργων τῶν πρὸ τῶν Σταυροφοριῶν Βυζαντινῶν μίμων, ὡς δὲ γνωστὸν ὁ 'Αρλεκῖνος ἀναφαίνεται τὸ πρῶτον ἐν τῇ Δύσει μετὰ τὰς Σταυροφορίας· "καὶ πρὸς γέλωτας βρασματώδεις παρακινοῦσι καὶ καγχασμούς . . . . οἷά εἰσι τὰ τῶν μίνων οἳ ποτὲ μὲν 'Αράβιτας μιμούμενοι, ποτὲ δὲ 'Αρμενίους, ποτὲ δὲ δούλους, ἐνίοτε δ' ἕτερ' ἄττα, τοῖς ἐπὶ κόρρης ῥαπίσμασι καὶ ψοφήμασι γέλωτας ἀπρεπεῖς κινοῦσι καὶ οἷον ἐκβακχεύουσι τοὺς ἀφελεστέρους καὶ ἀπροσεκτοτέρους." Ζωναρᾶ ἑρμενεία εἰς τὸν 51 κανόνα τῆς ἐν Τρούλλῳ συνόδου.

[1] Scott, *Bahar-I-Danish; or, Garden of Knowledge:* "The Brahmin with all exultation and vanity said, 'O my fellow-self and sharer of my griefs, sorrow not now, for I have learnt the four Vedas, and am chief of the learned professors.' The wife exclaimed, 'Woe is me, if thou hast not learned the fifth Veda.' The Brahmin replied, 'Why, woman, it has been ascertained by the most learned masters and pandits that the Vedas are four; wherefore then sayest thou there are five.' The woman instantly on hearing this speech, beating the hands of mortification against each other, cried out, 'What an unlucky fate is mine! Surely in the volume of the decree happiness was not affixed to my name, but in the divine records the impression of disappointment stamped on my lot. When thou went wandering in the maze of pilgrimage, day and night involved in sorrow, I had a hope, and lived on the perfume, pure as a Peri, of our meeting, trusting

from different classes of plays were brought together, the natural inference would be that the author conceived his work to be a compound of those classes. In this way may be explained the juxtaposition of the names Decius and Pyrrhus in the earliest known form of the *Comedy of Lydia.* This piece was written by Matthew of Vendôme[1] early in the second half of the twelfth century. This Matthew was considered in his time a master of style, and among his poems were treatises on

that one day thou wouldst return and deliver me from torment. Now thou art come back, my hope is changed to fear, and the links of enjoyment broken. . . . . The ruler of this city hath a difficult case before him, the solution of which depends on the Tirrea Veda; and today they have taken all the Brahmins to his awful court. As they are ignorant of the Fifth Veda, they have been imprisoned by order of the sovereign.' " To escape their probable fate, the Brahmin sets out again on his travels, and, "having reached the environs of a certain city, sat down sorrowful on the terrace of a draw-well, to which by chance soon came five women from the town. They saw that the rose of the Brahmin's cheek was withered and parched by the burning sun of sorrow, and his heart, like the bud of a flower, compressed and blighted. They enquired, 'Whence art thou come, whither art thou going, and on what account art thou in the perplexity of grief and melancholy?' The young Brahmin disclosed the circumstances, and as they possessed perfect skill in the Tirrea Veda —on hearing his story, they expanded their mouths in laughter, for they guessed that his wife was an able professor, and in order to follow her own pleasures had committed the simple man to the deserts of pilgrimage. Taking pity on his forlorn condition and ignorance, they said, 'Ah! distracted youth, and poor wanderer from the path of knowledge, although the Tirrea Veda is as a stormy sea, nay, even a boundless deep, which no philosopher can fathom by the aid of profound wisdom; yet comfort thy soul for we will solve thy difficulty, and expound to thee the mysteries of this science." (Pp. 87, 89.)

[1] Cloetta, *Beiträge zur Litteraturgeschichte*, Vol. II, p. 79, attributes the poem to an anonymous imitator of Matthew. The controversy on the subject is more curious than important.

grammar and prosody, a paraphrase of the book of Tobias, beside the licentious so-called *Comedy of Lydia.*

Allusion has been made to the dramatic quality of Chaucer's narrative verse. It is a point which Thelwall[1] was perhaps the first to emphasize, and it is now rarely missed by the eulogists of the *Canterbury Tales.* Granting all that is claimed for the individual genius of Chaucer, it must be said that such tales as he told, and in some cases the very same tales, had long been put habitually in the dramatic form, as that was understood in the Middle Ages. Language, usually the irregular Latin of the times; taste, which since the days of Seneca had depreciated the stage; and lack of genius, preventing any from rising to the standard of Chaucer, much less to that of Shakespeare, Calderon, or Molière, nevertheless their aim is manifest, and the dramatic manner is obvious, as a mediaeval rhetorician remarked, using as an example an episode that might well have a place in the farce of *Pulcinella.*

I leave all gravity behind; I choose the commonest words; all my verbs are in the present tense, and I speak of things which happened long ago as if they were just passing before my eyes, thus:[2]

[1] See Thelwall's articles on Tyrwhitt's edition of Chaucer in *The Retrospective Review*, Vol. IX, Part I, p. 202 ff.

[2] Leyser, *Historia poetarum et poematum medii aevi*, p. 819. The verses are from Eberhard of Bethune, *Laborintus*, tract. 2, 169 f. The

Exit servus habens urnam in manibus; lapis obstat,
Nutat pes, urna frangitur, ille gemit.

This is a mere allusion to what was told more at length by other writers, for example:

We are three partners in expense, and we have no servant. Our agreement is that each in turn shall prepare dinner for all. The others having taken their turn, on the third day I am cook. I light the fire and see that I have no water. Hand to pitcher, away to the well; stone in the path, foot slips, pitcher breaks. Lo, a double damage—no pitcher, no water. What shall I do? Pondering, I enter a market-place. There sits one surrounded with pitchers. Fondly I handle them, now one, now another. The potter, seeing my hesitation, takes me for a thief. He loads me with abuse. Confused, I make off; but at sight of a friend a thought strikes me. I tell him how I have been insulted and then I say: "Come after me and pretend in a loud voice that you are sent to call me to my father's funeral. Then I hurry back to the pitchers. This hand snatches up a pitcher, this another, and my comrade rushes up crying, "What are you doing here, O unhappy. Your father, who was sick, is dead. Come——." My hands crash the pitchers together. Smash! I fly. Him who confused me I confound, and thus I reply to opprobrious words.

Most of the fables of Adolphus—which are not fables at all, but indecent stories in the style of the French *fabliaux*—are of this fashion, heightened, wherever possible, with dialogue. The first

other version is translated from Geoffrey de Vinsauf, *Poetria*, vss. 1883-1905. Leyser, pp. 967 f.

of them is an abbreviated variant of *The Merchant's Tale;* and the poem of Matthew of Vendôme, the so-called *Comedy of Lydia*, is another, far more elaborate setting of the same theme—a complete specimen of the mediaeval recited drama. As the story corresponds almost exactly, allowing for a difference of names given to the characters, with the ninth novel of the seventh day in Boccaccio's *Decameron*, there is no necessity of analyzing a plot celebrated for its unrelieved blackguardism. To one who has followed the course of women novelists from Aphra Behn to the present day there can be little doubt that this tale was originated by a woman—some smiling, malicious inmate of an oriental harem.[1] The identity of the narrative, as given respectively by Matthew and by Boccaccio, is of value in tracing its derivation. That it was oriental at the outset is conceded. But Boccaccio got much[2] of this kind which appeared, not only in his *Decameron*, but also in the *Theseide* and in the *Genealogies of the Gods*, from the Byzantines whom he met in Italy. His teachers—Barlaam, Leontius, and others—were a mine of information on literature of various kinds which never reached the West at all except in their oral communications. Of Leontius, Boccaccio himself said that he was a repertory

[1] Scott, *Bahár-I-Danish*, pp. 94 f.

[2] This is not meant to exclude his debts to older romances of the West. See Hazlitt's *Warton*, Vol. II, pp. 307 f.

of Greek tales and fables. These Byzantine story-tellers had already fallen into the hands of Paulus Perusinus, librarian about the middle of the fourteenth century to Robert, King of Jerusalem, who employed them, Barlaam especially, to secure rare or little-known Greek manuscripts, romances, and poems of the mediaeval period. Out of this material Paulus made up a book of selections which was used by Boccaccio, but was afterward lost. The literary activity of Constantinople, though without originality, was incessant. The tales of the West as well as of the East were at once rendered into Greek as soon as they became known, so that a complete library of manuscripts from the last age of Byzantium would have been a compend, not only of ancient Greek and Roman writings, but of all accessible recent and contemporary literature of Europe and Asia, and of the civilized parts of Africa. Homer and King Arthur and Boddhisatva stood side by side, all turned into mediaeval Greek and more or less transformed to the likeness of eastern Christianity. Buddha had, indeed, been literally converted into a Greek saint, Josaphat, by John of Damascus. In addition to the few Greek romances which have survived from comparatively early times, there was a mass of erotic prose fiction, for bulk and worthlessness surpassed only by the novel of the present day. It is not to be supposed that the Byzantine

stage neglected this multitude of tales. Possibly many of Boccaccio's novels were paraphrases of mediaeval Greek dramas. In fact, there was no way of publishing a book intended for the populace except by public recitation; only the rich could afford libraries or could give time to private reading. Every romance then had a dramatic aspect, since it was read to the public with all the art that could make it attractive. The story of Lydia may be considered one of these Byzantine dramatic tales. In Boccaccio all the characters have Greek names, that of the aged and ill-used husband being Nicostratus, that of the wife's lover, Pyrrhus. Wherever this name "Pyrrhus" occurs, one may be sure, as Diomedes says, that the tale in which it figures harks back to the satyric drama of the Graeco-Roman stage. It is not certain how the name acquired this significance, but the analogy of Autolycus suggests the myths of Greece. In those ancient tales Pyrrhus figured as the son of Achilles.[1] When Achilles was hidden in woman's dress among the maids in the palace of Lycomedes, his sex was soon discovered by the king's daughter, Deidamia. She gave birth to a son, who as soon as he grew up, was carried to Troy, under the name of Neoptolemus, to aid the Greeks in the capture of the city. Dressed in his father's armor, he slew Eurypalus and the aged

[1] Ovid, *Heroides*, Epist. viii.

King Priam, and, when the captive women were distributed, received Andromache, the widow of Hector, as his prize. In his later adventures he goes by the name of Pyrrhus. It would be supposed that he might have been satisfied with the possession of a woman renowned for her beauty and goodness. But he gave her away to Helenus, and sought another companion. The daughter of Menelaus and Helen, Hermione, was betrothed to him in the time of the Trojan War by her grandfather. Menelaus, not aware of this, gave her to Orestes, to heal the feud in which Orestes threatened to destroy all who had any share, direct or indirect, in bringing about the death of his father, Agamemnon, Menelaus' brother. Helen escaped the sword of Orestes only by the intervention of Apollo, who changed her into a star, and saved Hermione by commanding the avenger to marry her. Pyrrhus, on his return from war, abducted Hermione in her husband's absence, but only to treat her with contempt and to annoy her with ostentatious scorn of her husband's courage and prowess. In order to complete the fragmentary narrative, Ovid imagines Hermione relating all her grievances in a long letter to Orestes and goading him to vengeance. According to Greek ideas, lust could hardly go farther than Pyrrhus did in seizing a wife given to Orestes by the gods, while Orestes himself was absorbed in a task of

expiation which the gods had required. The arrogance of Pyrrhus aggravated his offense, and there was also in his case the fatality familiar to Greek tragedy, which in these modern times is called heredity. Out of the antique conception of Pyrrhus' innate criminality might easily grow the conception in later times of a character utterly abandoned to lascivious delights, always intent on new seductions, for whom common decency must decree a violent death, not by public law, but by private vengeance. Meanwhile each of his amours might furnish the material of a novel or a play. As the Autolycus of Shakespeare is only an ordinary cut-purse and ballad-monger, Mercurial, but not a son of Mercury, so Matthew's Pyrrhus is a mere reflection of some remote original. The old husband, however, instead of bearing a Greek name, is called Decius. This, as already remarked, is one of the names specified by Diomedes as usual in those dramas called the *togatae;* and, as would be expected, the character is that of a man of rank, wealth and public position. Apart from his excessive fondness for his wife, his readiness to submit even to cruelties at her hands, and to believe her against the evidence of his own senses, he does not belie his dignity. The name Decius does not preclude the thought of a Greek origin for the *Comedy of Lydia*, as inferred from the divergent version of Boccaccio. The various

Italian forms of popular drama had long been domesticated in Byzantium, and still continued to flourish there in the period—from the sixth to the eleventh century—when they were apparently forgotten throughout the West. In opening his poem Matthew alluded to an earlier piece in which he had celebrated other exploits of Lydia. This poem is extant under the title *De Milone.* The name "Milo" suggests a Greek source, but Matthew put the matter beyond doubt by a distinct reference to Constantinople.

> Non phalero falsum: Constantinopolis hujus
> Se spectatricem jactitat esse rei.
> Non levis arbitrium linguae non livor obumbret
> Debile Matthaei Vindocinensis opus.[1]

If one of these poems was Constantinopolitan in scene and action, probably the other was too, and both are precisely of the kind suited to the art of the mimes, apologized for by Choricius, domestic and indecent, and at the same time in accord with the traditions of the old popular comedy respecting the cunning wife and the husband too easily outwitted. It is unfortunate that the nature of these works, which seem to reflect so closely the dramatic amusement of Byzantium in the small theaters and dance-houses that were suppressed by Justinian, but which doubtless did not stay

[1] Du Meril, *Poésies inédites du moyen âge*, p. 353, note 2. The text of the *Comedy of Lydia* begins on the same page.

suppressed any more than their counterparts do in modern cities, should preclude analysis. But the reading of Boccaccio's novel will show how the Greek actors might have performed it; while a comparison of Matthew's poem with its analogue, *The Merchant's Tale*, will prove that, if Chaucer is the father of English comedy, he merely passed on, improved, to his successors an estate which he inherited from others.

VI

The exploits of Lydia are surpassed in another Pyrrhic poem. William of Blois, brother of the better-known Peter of Blois, though he was a churchman of rank, devoted his leisure to the writing of what were called comedies and tragedies; among the rest, the tragedy of *Flaurus and Marcus*, a poetical fable of *The Flea and the Fly*, and the *Comedy of Alda*.[1] It is this last title which is in dispute, for it seems that a poet named Hildebert also tried his hand at the subject. An objection to coupling the name of William of Blois with such a work as the *Alda* is that Peter would hardly have boasted on his brother's account of a work so licentious. This argument is not a strong one, for the mediaeval literature of France offers

[1] Du Meril, *Poesies inédites*, pp. 425–42. Du Meril attributes the authorship to Matthew of Vendôme. But Cloetta argues forcibly against this and in favor of William of Blois. As they were practically contemporary, the argument makes no change in the date of the poem.

not a few wicked tales from priestly pens. Balzac makes an abbé the narrator of one of the worst in his *Contes drolatiques*, and intimates too that this abbé never told a decent story if he could help it. Du Meril associated the work with the *Comedy of Lydia*, because the author of *Alda* cites a woman named Sabina as a type of virtue, and this Sabina was known to him otherwise only by a similar allusion in the *Comedy of Lydia*, the authorship of which is unquestioned. But Peiper showed that this name was familiar to both Horace and Ovid.[1] The fragments of a more dignified poem in hexameters on the subject, which Du Meril mentions, may well belong to Hildebert or some other poet.

One of the most natural and obvious additions to the story of Pyrrhus would be to attribute to him an adventure similar to that of his father which led to his birth. It is necessary to suppose that, when Achilles was introduced in female attire among the maids in the palace of Lycomedes, the cheat was known to none. The girls supposed him to be a girl like themselves. Byron seized the same device to lend piquancy to the adventures of Don Juan in the seraglio. The Greek view of the incident is given in the epithalamion of *Achilles and Deidamia*, sometimes credited to Theocritus, sometimes to Bion:

[1] *Archiv für Litteraturgeschichte*, Vol. V, p. 525. Compare Horace, *Epodes*, ii, 14; Ovid, *A.*, iii, 8, 61.

LYCIDAS . . . . But what shall I sing?

MYRSON. As when singing the Scyrian Lycidas, you sing love, the stolen kisses of the son of Peleas, the stolen couch, how the boy put on a veil, how he disguised his form and evaded the law among the careless Lycomedian girls that Achilles was not to sleep in the chamber of Deidamia.

LYCIDAS. When the herdsman ravished Helen and led her to Ida, sore grief to Oenone, Lacedaemon was wrathful and gathered the Achaeans; at home stayed not a single Hellene of Mycenae or Elis or Sparta, all went to war. Achilles alone was hidden among the daughters of Lycomedes, learning wools instead of arms, and to look with white hands, like a girl. He looked the maid with the red and the white in his smooth face, his mincing gait and his long hair wrapped in a net, though he had a man's courage and a man's desire. From dawn to dark he sat beside Deidamia, touching her hand, often lifting the beautiful warp in her loom and praising the soft thread; he ate with no other companion, and his whole thought was how he might be her bedfellow. At last he said: "The other sisters sleep with one another; but I alone, and thou alone. The two virgin comrades, both handsome, let us sleep together in one bed. The wretched night with crafty distraction divides me from thee. For not I ——[1]

The rest is lost. But the success of the guileful trick put upon Deidamia is foreshadowed, and just such a trick is the intent of the *Comedy of Alda*. It begins tragically with the death of the mother, also named Alda, who in a really pathetic scene leaves her new-born daughter to her husband as a

[1] Ahrens, *Bucolicorum Graecorum reliquiae*, pp. 123 f.

perpetual memorial of herself. He loves the little one for her mother's sake, and resolves to watch over her with the utmost care. But as most men err, so he made the mistake of thinking that the only way to keep a girl safe was to lock her up, and he turned his house into a prison. Thus Alda grew up a beautiful girl, without ever having seen a man except her father. Unfortunately, a girl who is admitted to the house as a companion to Alda, has a brother, the twin image of herself. This youth, Pyrrhus, falls in love with Alda on the mere report of her charms. He languishes in the usual way, falls ill, and begs his servant to think of some plan by which he can gratify his desires. The servant in turn consults an old trot with whom he is familiar. These two are the buffoons of the piece, and coarse beyond measure. As a last device, the old woman makes the boy up in his sister's clothes, trains him to walk in petticoats, and sends him into the house. The rest of the tale goes without saying, though it cannot be allowed that the so-called comedy leaves any detail of it, even the most incredible, unsaid. The comment of Alda's father, that a woman without a man will make a man for herself, is the essence of much mediaeval criticism on the sex. Owing to gossip which threatens the good name of his sister, Pyrrhus confesses his offense and makes Alda his wife, the poet having taken the precaution which

Cora takes in her own behalf on falling into the rude hands of Daphnis—to discover that birth and fortune on both sides make a suitable match.[1]

Only the names of the brother and sister, Pyrrhus and Pyrrha, suggest the Greek origin of the drama. Ulfas and Alda, the names of father and daughter, have a Gothic sound, while Spurius and Spurca, the names of the clowns, may be traditional in some form of Latin popular play, that of Spurius being familiar to Latin history, but with a curious meaning. Spurca,[2] as an epithet, indicated the utmost vileness in a woman. The poet claims a Greek original, asserting with considerable detail that he borrows from Menander. He may refer, unconsciously perhaps, to some other than the great Menander, for he speaks of the story as having only lately become known in Latin:

Venerat in linguam nuper peregrinam Latinam
  Haec de Menandri fabula rapta sim.
Vilis et exul erat, et rustica plebis in ore,
  Quae fuerat comis vatis in ore sui.
Dumque novum studium comoedia quaereret illa
  Quem vice Menandri posset haberi sui
Me pro Menandro volui sibi reddere, longe
  Impar proposito, materiaque minor.[3]

It is worth mentioning that the Byzantine stage, late in the mediaeval period, had a second Menan-

[1] Ahrens, *op. cit.*, p. 127; Θαριστύς, vss. 40–43.

[2] Martial, *Epigr.*, i, 35.

[3] Du Meril, *Poesies inédites*, p. 426.

der.[1] He was a lawyer, and in his last years a historian. It is perhaps to him that Gower alludes, confused by the name, as one of the earliest "Enditours of the old cronyke."[2] In his youth, when he was known by another name, he deserted law for the drama, and it was as a playwright that he earned the name by which he has since been known. Of his theatrical writings, with a single exception, even the titles are unknown. Probably he himself destroyed them, as was the case with Nicephorus Basilaces, who flourished in the times of the Comneni. Nicephorus in his youth wrote satyric plays. Later he became ashamed of these performances and devoted much effort to searching out and destroying all the copies. Only the titles have been preserved, namely, Ὀνοθρίαμβος, Στύπαξ or Παραδεισοπλαστία, Στεφανίται, Ταλαντοῦχος Ἑρμῆς.[3] These indicate that the hypothetic Παρθενοσανδρεῖα of Du Meril, as a name for the play of Menander cited in *Alda*, would not be impossible on the Byzantine stage,[4] if it were not beyond credibility as a Greek compound word. Peiper has suggested the following preferable expressions: ἀνδροπάρθενος, γύνανδρος, ἀνδρόθηλυς,

[1] Usually called the Protector. Like Mussato at a later time, he was a military leader as well as a man of letters.

[2] Gower, *Confessio amantis* (Morley's edition), p. 203.

[3] Sathas, τξθ'.

[4] Sathas, τπθ'. See Peiper, *Archiv für Litteraturgeschichte*, Vol. V, p. 527.

ἀνδρόπαις, ἀνδρόγυνος; the last being the most likely word, as it is the counterpart of hermaphrodite and was in common use as descriptive of an effeminate man; but γύνανδρος and ἀνδρόθηλυς are equivalents; while ἀνδρόπαις is out of the question, and ἀνδροπάρθενος is dubious as an actual form. Though the conjecture that William may have had a mediaeval Greek drama or dramatic recitation in mind is not superfluous, it is nevertheless possible that he may have come across a Latin paraphrase or abstract of a genuine play by the Great Athenian. Peiper has shown from fragmentary indications that such a play once existed and had been translated for the Roman stage by Caecilius Statius, the immediate predecessor and earliest literary friend of Terence. But it could not have been this ancient version by Caecilius which was seen by William of Blois. The latter was a man of experience. He lived part of his life as a courtier and ecclesiastic of rank in the Norman kingdom of Sicily. His acquaintance with manuscripts and the differences of literary style was such that he would have recognized the antiquity of a work by Caecilius. Besides, Caecilius had some gross faults, particularly in the invention of compound words, which were censured by Cicero and other authors who were read by mediaeval men of letters, especially from the beginning of the university period. It

is probable that he tells the exact truth in the passage quoted, and that his original was a recent Latin paraphrase. But this forgotten play of Menander was very unlikely to have been accessible in his time outside of Constantinople.

The poem *Alda* is in narrative form, with dialogues highly dramatic in style, exactly suited to a performance in which the recitation and acting were assigned to different persons. But it is a question whether a piece as frankly and laboriously indecent could be exhibited in public. There is a passage in the works of John of Salisbury, bearing on this point, in which he declares that even in the houses of the great the players of his day perpetrated such acts, openly displaying what should be hidden, as would shame a cynic to behold. This shows that neither actor nor spectator had changed much since the days of Chrysostom.[1] To laugh and to be the cause of laughter, said this fiery antagonist of the theater in the fourth century, to wanton and to revel, are the business of the debauched women and the men, parasites and flatterers, searched out for these purposes.

[1] Montfaucon, *Chrysostom, Opera omnia*, Vol. VII, pp. 99-101; IV, 769-71, 729-32; VI, 29, 113, 114, 421, 422 f.; XI, 464, 465; IX, 86; X, 103; VII, 675; V, 77, 133; IV, 686; VII, 675; XI, 403, 253, 152 f., 609. Quoted *in extenso* by Sathas, νς'-ξς'. Only the clauses pertinent to the matter in hand have here been paraphrased. To these passages quoted, Sathas adds the following citations: I, 469, 501, 649, 790, 793; II, 157, 317, 319, 341, 342; III, 51; V, 132, 193; VI, 77, 274-77; VII, 15, 115, 117, 226, 421, 497-99, 500 f., 673, 675, 712; VIII, 109 f., 253, 343, 357 f.; X, 103; XI, 125, 153 f., 392; XII, 383.

None would wish in the market-place or in his own house to see women naked; he would call such a spectacle disgraceful. But he and others like him resort to the theater to be amused by just such a sight, and to shame their own eyes. It is no excuse to say that the naked women in this case are harlots, for by nature the body, whether of the vicious woman or of the virtuous, is the same. If this immodesty be proper in the theater, why is it improper in the agora? What can be worse than women swimming naked in the presence of a multitude? Yet they call this sea of perdition a Euripus of delight. Here Chrysostom is supposed to have alluded to performances of a comedy of Philemon which had as its hypothesis the myth attributed to the Hyperboreans concerning the River of Pleasure—a fiction turned to lyric use in *The Spectator*.[1] In the theater also, Chrysostom says, are represented adulteries and crimes against marriage, and women in the closest embraces of men, as in the *Moechus* of Philemon or the *Moechi*, of Antiphanes; men hetaerized; youths enervated; all full of indecency, wonder, and shame. The very contact of the assemblage is heating. The pressure and sight of the bare limbs of women—Ovid had previously observed this, but not for purposes of moral censure—the skin-tight gar-

[1] *Spectator*, No. 406. Only the two closing stanzas are pertinent. The translation appears to have been by Tickell.

ments, the open bosoms, a hint of the physical perfections of the owners. Even at weddings these characters of the stage are brought in singing hymns to Aphrodite, celebrating adulteries and the broken vows of wedlock, illicit loves, and lawless indulgence. With such obscenities on such a day they parade the virtuous bride.

In spite of the animus of Chrysostom and the exaggeration unavoidable in oratory, enough remains to fit out even a play like *Alda* for the less creditable Byzantine theaters. To western peoples with whom a naked Adam and Eve were the rule in a religious Mystery of the Creation, possibly even within the walls of a church, it is not likely that anything which could be described in writing was beyond the limits of representation, unless physically impossible, with strolling players and an indulgent assemblage of what Hamlet called barren spectators. The author of *Alda*, having proclaimed the Menandrian origin of his tale, tells how it was abandoned to the vulgar, and he makes the concession to modesty of saying that it is not he who is obscene, but his material—an apology which is at least as old as Martial, but renewed with every sensational novelist of the present day. Whether acted or not, the little poems of *Milo*, *Lydia*, and *Alda*, are significant documents —as evincing the kind of popular legends, in which the common civic, ecclesiastical, and feudal

life was treated with the license soon to be cultivated by the French *jongleur* and his *fabliaux*— of the vital interest taken in such popular tales by the Latin poesy of the schools and cloisters, and at the same time notable monuments in the history of the drama. They attest the survival in a recognizable form of elements from the ancient Latin popular drama; they offer the presumption that this survival was due to the preservation of Latin traditions and Roman manners at Byzantium; and they add one more item to the debt, very grudgingly acknowledged, of modern civilization to the Eastern Empire.

VII

Were it not for the perversity of human nature, which rejects the real wit and humor of a past age and carefully preserves its pornic anecdotes as if these were amusing, no doubt there would be comedies as clever as *Lydia* or *Alda* that might still be quoted in full. The Byzantines, for their part, seem to have considered nothing worth preserving unless some writer sought to illustrate a fact or thought important to his own theme. One such passage seems to have significance in this place. If the Autolycus of Shakespeare and the Pyrrhus of Matthew of Vendôme and William of Blois answer, respectively, to the Autolycus and Pyrrhus of the plays that Diomedes knew, then, perhaps, the savage piece that brought

Nicephorus, the prefect of Constantinople, to the stake was devised in the form of an Atellan farce. The fragment of dialogue ran thus in the Greek:[1]

Πρῶτος μῖμος.—Χάνε, κατάπιε αὐτό.
Δεύτερος μῖμος.—Οὐ δύναμει τοῦτο ποιῆσαι.
Τρίτος μῖμος.—Ὁ πραιπόσιτος Νικηφόρος
τῆς χήρας τὸ πλοῖον γέμον κατέπιε, καὶ σὺ
οὐκ ἰσχύεις φαγεῖν τοῦτο; κ. τ. λ.

As this scene was said to have been modeled on one that took place in the time of Valentinian, it shows that the old stage tradition was unbroken in the time of the emperor Theophilus, under whom Nicephorus was punished. A correct writer, not intentionally ignorant of dramatic affairs, would probably have given the mimes their proper appellations. A single word, however, shows that the second mime is Bucco. He is called Χάνη—that is, "Big Mouth"—by his companion. The inference is that here Maccus, Bucco, and Pappus reappear for an instant, busy with their historic task of exposing wrong-doers in high places, too powerful to be reached except by the gibes of actors protected by an inviolable disguise. In the *Atellanae*, as is well known, the players were legally and by immemorial usage entitled to keep their masks on under all circumstances. The word Χάνη has additional appropriateness in the

[1] Sathas, να'.

case of a person requested to swallow a boat, in that it is the name of a wide-mouthed sea-fish.

If these reminiscences of the ancient popular drama, handed down by actual practice from age to age, be added to the Mysteries and Moralities partly sanctioned and partly merely tolerated by the church, it can be seen how the theatrical instincts of mediaeval Europe were satisfied without recurrence to the works of Seneca or to his method. One might say roughly that the modern world was passing through stages in dramatic history similar to those which ancient Greece and Rome had occupied one after another. True, the spring and harvest feasts of the Teutons had not developed like the vintage merrymakings of Greece; but the reason was that the church had supervened with a more complicated drama borrowed ready-made from Byzantium. Genuine tragedy had not emerged from the religious play, because, in spite of its crudity, the religious play was really more serious and of richer contents than tragedy as known to the Greeks and Latins; it was replete with tragical elements in which every spectator beheld the fate, not of some mythical hero, but of himself and his neighbors. As ordinary human life mingles serious things with ludicrous, so the religious play was patched with comedy. The revulsion from it was first toward an increase of the comic element, and the compo-

sitions of Roswitha, which were comedies only in the fact that they ended in good fortune, were but a remote forecast of the humors that broke out when attention was directed to the surviving traditions of the Graeco-Latin popular drama. Meanwhile, acting, in the modern meaning of the term, remained unknown. The religious play, notwithstanding its dialogue, was a spectacle rather than a play, and the secular pieces, to use an apparently, but not really, contradictory phrase, were rhetorical pantomimes. Here, *mutatis mutandis*, were the very conditions under which Seneca wrote—spectacles which he despised, and a stage on which tragedy could be read only to the few who cared for it, with the addition of dance and gesture by mimetic experts. It was left for someone to wake up to the fact that most of the dramatic works of Seneca were still extant.

Aside from the question to what extent Seneca was read in the West during the Dark Ages, there is evidence that he was known in Byzantium, if the Greek tragedy of *Clytaemnestra*, formerly included in editions of Sophocles, be, as is supposed, a version of the lost work of Seneca under that title. If one of Seneca's plays was translated into mediaeval Greek, it is likely that others were, especially those which belonged to the same cycle with the *Clytaemnestra*. There is a modern Greek play written in Crete by a contemporary of

Shakespeare and Ben Jonson, entitled *Erophile.*[1] Like some of Shakespeare's works, it was based on a drama or tale that had been in existence long before. Its plot is in substance that of Boccaccio's novel of *Tancred and Sigismunda.* It has been pointed out that the various authors of this piece —for it must have had at least two, the redactor of the sixteenth century and his unknown predecessor, and there are several other claimants— had read Giraldi's *Orbecchi* and Trissino's *Sophonisba;* and more significant, for the present purpose, the *Antigone* of Sophocles, the *Cynegetica* of Oppian, and the *Thyestes* of Seneca. Of course, these details are not conclusive; but, at least, they open the question and indicate that the fame of Seneca in the Middle Ages is not solely a part of western literary history. Given a Byzantine vogue, and all the possibilities are raised of a stage tradition involving Seneca's tragedies, still living in the time of Dante and his contemporary and acquaintance, the Senecan enthusiast Mussato.[2]

Alberto Mussato, military leader and man of letters, was a native of Padua. He was for many years commander of the militia of the commune; but in his old age, with customary Italian grati-

[1] Sathas, Κρητικὸν Θέατρον ἢ Συλλογὴ Ἀνεκδότων καὶ Ἀγνώστων Δραμάτων, pp. 285–467. This part of Sathas' work is here cited for the first time.

[2] The details of Mussato's life and literary achievement are dwelt upon at length by both Cloetta and Creizenach.

tude, the city sent him into exile. He died in 1329. His fame in recent times has rested upon his voluminous history of the reign of the emperor Henry VII. He wrote a book on fate, long since lost, which is supposed to have been a precursor of Boccaccio's *De casibus*. His writings include also letters, satires, soliloquies, eclogues, a cento from Ovid, an ode to Priapus, an epic in three books on the war between Padua and the followers of Lewis Scaliger, an ode to his wife, and other pieces. A series of periochae to the tragedies of Seneca, still extant is supposed to be from his pen, in addition to a tragedy on the deeds and death of Ezzelino da Romano, entitled *Eccerinis*. As this is a history, it is in effect a revival, under changed conditions, of the *praetextatae* of ancient times, as well as a premonition of the Jesuit dramas which opened the way to the histories of Shakespeare. At first glance it seems incredible that such a work as the *Eccerinis* should have grown out of the study and imitation of Seneca, who as a tragic writer sought merely to reiterate the hero-tales of ancient Hellas. But Seneca was vastly more observant of the limitations of real men and women than even Euripides. Mussato's instincts were more trustworthy for the evolution of the drama than the deductions of formal critics either of the Renaissance or later. The latter, almost without exception, have united

in condemning the plays of Seneca for their rhetorical coloring, their false passion, and their want of dramatic interest. In order to understand Mussato's attitude toward these plays, the modern view of classical excellence must be reversed. This does not mean that the thirteenth-century Italian lacked or repudiated the standards of learning. The contrary is shown by the fact that he was distinguished with special honors by the university of Padua and was crowned as the poet-laureate of the city. But Mussato, though up to the standards of his age in learning, was certainly far from being antiquated. He lived in his own age, not in the past, and he saw in Seneca one who had lived in the same way. Seneca, in spite of his subject-matter, was as much of a realist as Zola. The false rhetoric attributed to him is very similar to the fine writing of the modern novelist; both being the product of morbid, unhealthy, pessimistic times. The similarity is disguised by the fact that Seneca dealt exclusively with archaic themes. But these were both historical and actual to his contemporaries; historical, in that the sometime existence of Hercules, Oedipus, Thyestes, Agamemnon, and the rest was universally accepted; actual, in that the traits given to these heroes, the words they spoke, and the details of their acts were typical of traits, words, and deeds familiar to the sanguinary Rome of Nero. The

same could still be said of Mussato and his contemporaries. This realistic bent in the tragedies of Seneca has misled modern critics to a degree that allows them totally to misconceive and misrepresent his method. They allege against him a violation of the decencies of the ancient stage, as practiced and taught by his Greek predecessors. Thus he is supposed to represent Manto, the witch of the *Oedipus*, as making her inspection of the sacrifice before the eyes of the people in the theater. It would certainly not have shocked a Roman assemblage to witness the priestly autopsy of a victim, if the occasion were to their minds a proper one. Passages in the poems of Prudentius[1] illustrate the revolting nature of the pagan sacrifices, not only tolerated, but enhanced as a function of worship. But it would have horrified Romans, even in the cynical times of Seneca, to see the rites of religion counterfeited by the mimes. A very little reflection should convince the most prejudiced that the elaborate investigation of these entrails, and of the omens drawn from the action of the flesh in the fire on the altar or from the color, the activity or the languor of the flames, which belongs to the part of Manto, is wholly simulated and verbal, not visible and actual. Manto reports to her blind father, the seer Tiresias, in the minutest detail all that is supposed to happen to the sacri-

[1] Prudentius, *Contra Symmachi orationem*, i, 396 ff.; *Peristephanon*, x, 1006 ff.

ficial victim from the moment it is brought to the altar till the effort to consume it in a proper and auspicious manner is pronounced a failure. The whole scene is imagined by the poet with his thoughts concentrated upon the catastrophe of his drama. If the marks of the slaughtered victim, the color and conduct of the flames on the altar, failed the description in the slightest particular, the whole tragic hypothesis would have been upset. A discrepancy would have turned tragedy to satire, and very impious and sacrilegious satire at that. Yet not one sacrifice in a million could be depended on to present the series of phenomena so vividly described. It was thus physically impossible for Seneca to give a successful travesty of the sacrificial rites. Manto's proceedings were duly adapted to the necessities of the case. She had to describe, with the accuracy of ritual, what her blind father wished to know. This she must do in a way to convince people who could see. To a Roman audience, acquainted with sacrificial science, her verses were calculated to be of dire and thrilling import. The hearers translated them at once into visual facts. An actual sacrifice would infallibly have contradicted the words. Hence there was none. Manto was as discreetly hidden from the people in front of the stage as was the slayer of Agamemnon in Sophocles, or any other butcher in Greek tragedy.

The case of Medea slaying her children is not governed so imperiously by the disclosures of the verse, though here too the requirements of the spoken word could not have been evaded in the action without grotesque results, and analogy suggests that the audience was only verbally in the confidence of the personae of the stage. In the *Phaedra*, no doubt, the unnatural and incestuous passion of the heroine was represented in deed as well as word up to the moment when she was contemptuously repulsed by Hippolytus. But here Seneca is clearly in line with a realism thoroughly modern. As a moralist he is far more effective than his Greek models, for the simple reason that his lack of refinement makes that obtrusively disgusting which their delicacy extenuated.

The exaggerations of Seneca's tragic style are comparable to those of Italian tragedy in all ages, and are reflected in many passages of Shakespeare. They are anticipatory of the absurdities of Italian opera. Swollen rhetoric has never looked unnatural on the stage to Italians, least of all to Italians of the Renaissance. To an Italian communist of Mussato's time moderation of speech was as nearly impossible as it was to Americans during the slavery controversy; and the same might be said safely of Seneca's century. That was the age of Lucan in epic, of Petronius in satire and Martial in epigram, of the Chaldaean and Egyptian theur-

gists in what was supposed to be religion—an age of bloodshed, of mania, of apparitions, of imperial corruption, and of a socialism as irrational as that of the present day. Lucian, particularly in his amusing resolutions of the departed,[1] represented the skeptical revolt from the absurd theories of the age; Plutarch, the later reaction of the Hellenic mind;[2] and Seneca himself, in his prose writings, the effort of a fairly sane character to steady itself in the shifting currents and countercurrents of a political and social chaos.[3] When men congratulated themselves merely on being eccentric enough to outlive one tyrant or another,[4] tragedy could deal only in stilted and bombastic phrases. Men were too nervous to control their utterance. The spectacular drama of the Apocalypse, if read, not as prophecy, but as a vivid kinetoscopic picture of the times, is a real historical revelation. Even so self-centered a man as St. Paul betrayed in his letters the maddening effect of the anarchy in which he was involved. The

[1] At the conclusion of the *Menippus*.

[2] It has always seemed to the present writer that the best modern interpretation of Plutarch's attitude toward the religion and society of his time is that of Neander in the introduction to the first volume of his *History of the Church*. It begins on p. 13 of the second edition of Torrey's translation.

[3] Certainly there have been few ages in which a philosopher would have considered the emotion of anger and its manifestations worthy of a whole volume.

[4] Thus Tacitus remarks with bitter wonder on the fact that Lucius Piso was allowed to die a natural death at the age of eighty. *Annales* iv, 11: "rarum in tanta claritudine, fato obiit."

tragedies of Seneca must be read in this lurid light, if they are to be understood. Then they become vital, especially to men living in the midst of similar confusion, and their furious rhetoric is taken to be a natural form of speech. Men like Mussato think it fine to turn against tyrants the confession of the hideous Juno in the *Hercules furens:*

> Monstra jam desunt mihi;
> Minorque labor est Herculi jussi exequi,
> quam mihi jubere; laetus imperia excipit.[1]

They glory in the fact that hell itself has no terrors for the man of the people. "He will find a way," cries Amphitryon, "or make one:"

> Inveniet viam
> aut faciet.[2]

To the fears of Megara, Amphitryon responds in words that Mussato might well have shouted at the head of his troops:

> Immo quod metuunt nimis
> nunquam moveri posse nec tolli putant
> prona est timoris semper inpeius fides.[3]

The interminable jumble of mythological allusion was ceaselessly attractive to reawakened minds. Amphitryon, telling of the infant Apollo's battle with the forces of primeval disorder, must have spoken to the heart of a man who had spent

[1] *Hercules furens*, 40 ff. [2] *Ibid.*, 276. [3] *Ibid.*, 314 ff.

all his active years in war. The myth would be none the worse to mediaeval Italian taste for the antithesis of cynicism and high spirit in the tag:

LYCUS. Quemcumque miserum videris, hominem scias.

AMPHITRYON. Quemcumque fortem videris, miserum negas.[1]

The reproach that the monsters destroyed by Hercules, unlike later tyrants, were innocent of lust,

—qui tamen nullo stupro
haesere thalamos,[2]

must have come home with bitter realism to the experience of a patriot like Mussato. And nothing could sound more like hated words of his own time than the usurper's bold assertion of divine right,

quod Jovi, hoc regi licet;
Jovi dedisti conjugem, regi dabit.[3]

But enough of quotation. What has been said will suffice to show that Mussato was justified from the characteristics of his own age in laboring over the pages of Seneca. As for Mussato's own work, it is of significance only as indicating the emergence of Seneca from what might be called the dramatic subconsciousness of mediaevalism, just as Roswitha's shows how, at a much earlier time, Terence had come to the surface of European thought. Shake-

[1] *Hercules furens*, 463 f. [2] *Ibid.*, 488 f.

[3] *Ibid.*, 489 f. It is well to quote almost entirely from the Hercules plays, as they were particularly attractive to Mussato for a curious reason which he himself has given.

speare—not to mention others innumerable—gives ample evidence that neither of these dramatic exemplars was ever forgotten again.

VIII

There are some mistakes in history which seem to be inveterate. One of these is made by those writers who exploit the theory that the Byzantine literature was the mere decadent prolongation of the literature of ancient Hellas. This is only part of the truth, and it becomes wholly false as used in argument. When Constantine founded Constantinople, he transported every family of wealth and social position in Rome, which could be persuaded to emigrate, to his new capital. Rome itself sank to a subordinate position, even compared with other cities of Italy. Latin remained the legal language of the whole empire, east as well as west, down to a date after Justinian —so late, in fact, that the Hellenes within the memory of living men still called themselves Romans and their language Romaic. They were oblivious of their ancient affinities till they were reminded of them by scholars from western Europe. They did not know what the Parthenon was till they were told. The inference is that in the mediaeval period that which happened was a fusion of Greek and Latin influences; and this fusion is to be considered along with the fact that

after the time of Justinian, if not earlier, the revulsion to a Greek dialect became irresistible. It is well known now that the conservatism of the Greek local spirit was such that this Greek dialect remained more nearly like the ancient Greek than the English of modern London is like that of Chaucer, except in some details of syntax. Modern Greek rests upon a lot of props in the way of auxiliary verbs and prepositions which ancient Greek would have treated with contempt, and it uses some moods of the verb in a way which classic grammarians would have considered a sign of degeneracy, if not of downright insanity; but it has preserved a vast number of the old words without doing a thing to them beyond simplifying their inflection. As this neo-Hellenic language gradually spread in place of Latin, it absorbed the learning crystallized in both its great predecessors, in addition to taking in a great deal of contemporary information from the languages of the barbarians. The hide-bound exclusiveness of the ancient Hellene was not imitated by the Byzantines. Mixed in blood, the latter were also polyglot in language. No tongue which they needed in their diplomacy, their wars, or their commerce was long unknown to them, and they never gave up the study of the ancient literatures which they had inherited.

One important deflection of western thought on

this subject is due entirely to religious prejudice. The Latin church may be right doctrinally as to the procession of the Holy Spirit, but it is not justified in charging the Greeks with schism. If there was a schism, it was the birth of the Latin church as an ecclesiastical organism complete in itself. Those who doubt this have only to look at the documents of the ninth and tenth centuries to see how utterly Greek was the whole technical terminology of theology and ecclesiasticism throughout the entire West. The quarrel was the result of a natural rivalry between pupils and teachers. The West had outgrown the part of a learner, and it took prompt advantage in the ninth century of the fact that a woman pretended to be empress of the East. The malice in that line of the chronicles which begins to appear shortly, that thereafter the Eastern Empire ceases to be mentioned, is too obvious to need comment. If the machine of Byzantine policy had not already fallen, to use a mechanical phrase, upon a dead center, its engineers would have known what had happened to the influence which they had exerted upon the West for a thousand years. As it was, they were only too glad to feel that some of their possible enemies had forgotten them. But, as Chassang[1] says, it is

[1] Chassang, *Histoire du roman et de ses rapports avec l'histoire dans l'antiquité grecque et latin*, pp. 436-38: "Nous n'insisterons pas davantage sur les emprunts faits par la littérature byzantine aux narrations fabuleuses de l'antiquité, car la littérature byzantine n'est

a mistake to suppose that the movements of the barbarians interrupted for any prolonged interval the evolution of culture originating in Greek antiquity. The relations of the West and the East from Charlemagne's time on may not have been intimate, but they were never given up. The Hellenophile tendencies of the Saxon house have already been discussed in these pages. There is no evidence that the third Otto, though half Byzantine in blood, or any of those about him, knew

que la prolonguement et la décadence de la littérature grecque. Mais il est plus important de montrer de semblables emprunts dans les littératures de l'Occident au moyen âge. On est trop généralement porté à croire que, par suite des invasions, toute culture intellectuelle de l'antiquité, au moins de l'antiquité grecque, fut interrompue en Occident, et que la séparation des deux empires, aggravée plus tard par le schisme grec, créa deux mondes presque étrangers l'un à l'autre; le monde grec, décrépit mais toujours debout, et le vieux monde latin en proie aux barbares. Si les rapports furent peu fréquents entre l'empire d'Occident, renouvelé par Charlemagne, et l'empire d'Orient, ils ne cessèrent cependant jamais complètement; ils sont attestés par des ambassades reciproques et par des unions princières. La langue grecque eut en Occident de rares adeptes, mais son étude ne fut jamais abandonnée tout à fait; au temps de Charlemagne elle était représentée à Tours, à Metz, dans les monastères de Saint-Riquieret, de Saint-Gall; les moines d'Angleterre et surtout ceux d'Irlande la cultivaient. Un grand nombre de livres grecs avaient été traduits et remaniés en latin; c'est en latin que le moyen âge lisait les histoires du faux Dares et du faux Dictys, les fables d'Ésope ou l'Iliade d'Homère, et le moyen âge n'en croyait pas moins lire Homère, Ésope, Dictys ou Dares. Par l'intermédiaire de ces traductions latines plusieurs traditions de la littérature grecque se répandirent dans les œuvres du moyen âge, même dans les œuvres populaires. Des souvenirs, souvent bien altérés, mais qui ne sont pas contestables, de la littérature grecque, se recontrent par fois, soit dans les romans de chevalerie et dans les fabliaux, soit dans la Légende dorée et dans les Mystères."

In Chassang's list, p. 443, n. 1, of mediaeval tales of Troy, the poem of Wolfram von Eschenbach should be set down to the thirteenth not to the fourteenth century.

anything of classic Greek or its literature; though it is possible even in the tenth century to find men acquainted with such Greek tags as *γνῶθι σεαυτόν* and *μηδὲν ἄγαν*. But there is much to confirm the belief that he and many of his contemporaries became more or less familiar with what the Greek world itself called "Romaic"—that is, the Greek which Erigena had to learn before he translated the supposed works of Dionysius the Areopagite; of which the western scholastic had to know something in order to get at the philosophical and theological dicta collected by John of Damascus; the language of which all pilgrims had to get at least a smattering in traveling to or from the holy places of Palestine; the language—with a difference—which Byron wrote, and wrote incorrectly, in the refrain to his famous lyric, "The Maid of Athens." There is evidence that Charlemagne had an oral knowledge of this Greek vernacular, and that there were not a few clerics in his time, especially those who were musically educated, capable of reading and translating Romaic. There may even have been one man at the court of Charlemagne with some knowledge of ancient Greek literature, or at least that of early Greek Christianity—Alcuin, whose instructors at York had been disciples of Bede the Venerable, a man to whom both Greek and Hebrew, as exhibited in the Scriptures, were familiar.

On the other hand, it must seem that Charlemagne's value to the ages immediately succeeding his own has been exaggerated. He forced Christianity upon the Saxons, but he lighted not a spark of civilization among them. His own Franks, under his dynasty and his predecessors, had gradually become French, and it was not till the Saxons became ascendent east of the Rhine that there was a true German civilization. The tenor of many of the laws and documents attributed to him shows that he adopted in some cases what he did not understand.[1] Charlemagne gained most of his renown by the vanity which led him to Rome to be crowned as king of the Romans and anointed Emperor by the Pope. The first real Teuton who attempted to act on the legal rights which these foolish ceremonies were supposed to confer had to kill several thousand Italians.* That was Otto the Great, and the killings were repeated with periodical uni-

[1] Jenks, *Law and Politics in the Middle Ages*, p. 17: "But here we come upon one of the great sources of error in mediaeval history. The Frank Empire, in both its stages, was in a very important sense a sham empire. It aimed at reproducing the elaborate and highly organized machinery of the Roman State. Just as a party of savages will disport themselves in the garments of a shipwrecked crew, so the Merowingian and Karolingian kings and officials decked themselves with the titles and prerogatives, the documents, of the Imperial State. No doubt the wisest of them had a deliberate policy in so doing. But the majority seem to have been swayed simply by vanity, or ambition, or admiration. Their punishment was the downfall of the Frank empire; but they might have been consoled for their failure could they have looked forward a thousand years, and seen their pretensions gravely accepted by learned historians on the faith of documents pillaged from the Imperial chancery, which they scattered abroad without understanding their contents."

formity by his successors. The real beginner of a Teutonic civilization, as compared with a Gallic veneer on a Frankish lining, was Henry the Fowler, and he began at the very outset by confessing that he was not up to the tricks of ecclesiastical experts like Hatto and others. He would not be anointed by them, saying that he was unworthy; what he really feared was the magic which every savage thinks is a part of religion. But he was a thoroughly practical administrator of both civil and military affairs, a man of immense native ability, and he brought the whole vast expanse from the Rhine to the Slavic and Magyar borderland under control—a control which was perfected by his son, Otto the Great.

The connection between the empire of Charlemagne and that of the East was purely personal. He entertained delegations from Constantinople, and gathered hints for the scenic and musical improvement of the church service at his court. But when the Saxon empire was extended down the Danube to include the Austrian March and to the Greek states in southern Italy, communication between East and West became almost constant. Under such conditions men of diverse languages must learn to speak with one another. That is why Chassang can say that the Greek language had occasional adepts in the West throughout every generation; but the Greek was mediaeval,

not classic, and if classic authors were studied at all, it was in later paraphrases, not in their original form. The choice of a forgery by John Erigena for translation and commentary seems to illustrate the point. Erigena might not have been able to read Plato or Aristotle, if they had been accessible, but *Dionysius Areopagiticus* was written approximately in the Greek which Erigena learned to speak when he resided for a time in the East. It is a matter of common observation in these days of wholesale emigration that the newcomers in any country gain a practicable knowledge of its spoken language with marvelous celerity. There is no reason to suppose that the ancestors of these modern migratory Europeans were inferior in this respect. In the constant oral communication, which grew in volume steadily as commerce and travel increased, will be found the explanation of the way tales, temporarily or locally of remote origin, made their way into the literature of the West. Chassang is unquestionably right when he says that, whether modified in the transfer or not, the vast majority of the romances of Latin Europe in the mediaeval period, the fables, the *débats*, the subordinate narratives in works like the *Golden Legend* and *Dolopathos* and in the Mysteries, were filtered through a Greek medium.

The effect of the Crusades was not to lessen the importance of Constantinople as a clearing-house

for this trade in the raw material of literature, but to add direct barter with the Farther East. Then, as the Eastern Empire weakened under the constant pressure, first of the Saracen, then of the Venetian, and finally of the Ottoman, the centers of Arabic learning became the media through which western Europe renewed its acquaintance with the genuine literature of ancient Hellas, first in bad translations, then in more or less accurate copies of the original. By the close of the fifteenth century the learned men of Constantinople, now scattered by Turkish conquest, were ready to confess that the Greek muses had found a home beyond the Alps. A little later Greek learning became as familiar to England as to Germany. Thus by the dawn of Shakespeare's day it is found that since the times of Dante and Chaucer the literary center of gravity in Europe—and the same is true in politics, in war, in commercial activity—has shifted to the North and West. The ancient make-weight in the East, which had for ages kept the balance of civilization, has been cast away. Constantinople, with its Turks and dogs and seraglios and mosques, has become more oriental than the Orient itself. The whole area in which the old Hellenic culture flourished has been relinquished to the Asiatic. The nightmare of the West is now, and has been for three centuries, the peril of Ottoman invasion. It is

the Turk who figures in the calculations of a religious man like Luther when trying to interpret the last struggle of humanity as prefigured in the Johannine Apocalypse, in the romance of the period, as Gomberville's *Polexandre*, or in the adventures of a rambling lancer and swordsman like Captain John Smith.

By suppressing the Orthodox church as a factor of international politics, the Turk broke the only bond which held the two halves of the church in the West, the Latin and the Teutonic, together. First western Europe tried a schism with two popes —one at Avignon, the other at Rome. No sooner was that division healed than the real disruption took place between the old order of things and the Roman spirit of centralization, on the one hand, and, on the other, a new social order dimly foreshadowed in the English Schoolmen—Duns Scotus, Ockham, and Wiclyffe; a little more clearly outlined by Huss and Jerome of Prague; so clear to the downtrodden of Luther's time that it came near expression in his own narrow and concentrated mind. By Shakespeare's day the world had broken apart forever in religion and philosophy; it had discovered a new hemisphere; it had become as familiar with the Atlantic Ocean as it ever was with the Mediterranean Sea. England felt all the forces that pressed outward from the Old World. She became the target of

the diplomatic intrigues of rival nations. Her own strength was concentrated as it had never been concentrated before. Every intelligent Englishman was thinking, as hard as if he were Elizabeth's-prime minister, about England's difficulties, and England's hopes and fears. The world of London was full of novelties—of men and things from strange countries; of ideas which had never occurred, at least in form so concrete, to anybody before. It took the forces of a world to make a Shakespeare, and the forces of the world were actually turned in upon the England of Shakespeare's time. The phenomena of that era comprise nearly all that it is possible to anticipate in a revival of literature.

There can be no doubt that the nation to which Shakespeare belonged was peculiarly gifted in dramatic expression. Its modern supremacy in the art of the novelist, so different from the fiction developed by other nations, furnishes an argument on this point. But a better one is the dramatic quality of the great English poet who preceded Shakespeare at a time when the drama in almost every sense of the word was unknown in England. Chaucer had no thought of a stage; yet his *Canterbury Tales* have all the essentials of comedy, not merely in wit, humor, and poetry, but in the systematic development of the action, in the balance and diversification of character. The

same spirit was shown also by the other ancient English poets to an inferior degree, but enough to indicate the tendencies of the race to which they belonged. Thus, whatever may be said of Shakespeare individually may be said also, with hardly less emphasis, of the English race: that it was certain to produce a great drama as soon as it became familiar with the processes of the art. But the drama, in its perfection the highest form of literature, requires much more in the way of preparation than any other form. Other works of the literary artist may be published by recitation, by writing, or, as in modern times, by print. But a drama, to meet the only purpose of its composition, must be published in a representation by actors capable of setting it forth to audiences capable of understanding it. The old saying about the poet being born, not made, has its truth; but that truth is of less value, perhaps, in the case of the dramatist than in that of any other poet. Immense training is requisite, and, as most of this is autodidactic, the work of the poet himself as he grows up to the fulfilment of his aims, it is evident that conditions may easily be such as to preclude his ever emerging from the state in which he may cherish ideals, but cannot hope to realize them. The evolution of the actor is even more difficult. He is not born; he is made by the hardest kind of study and labor, and by the influence of a

tradition which, the more ancient it is, so it be vivid and vigorous, is the more potent in shaping him to the requirements of his art. This is equally true of audiences, though it may, at first sight, seem unreasonable to say so. It takes a great deal more training than one is conscious of to enable one to appreciate the performance of a play of Shakespeare. Nothing can be clearer than that audiences now, to which so much is offered besides the play itself—decorations of the theater, elaborate contrivances and scenery of the stage, and costumes in bewildering variety—are less keen than the audiences of Shakespeare's own time in the perception of those weightier matters—the fitness and beauty of words, the completeness of the poet's mastery over his theme, or the infinite suggestiveness compacted in his verse. Were the case otherwise, unquestionably the drama would again be what it was. Nature never leaves a real hiatus in the universe. If there were audiences now capable of understanding a true dramatic poet, the poet himself would be forthcoming. It will not do to say that the poet makes his audience. The fact is that they grow up together, and the same traditions which develop creative power in the poet awaken a comprehensive intelligence in those to whom his poetry is presented. These traditions are not the reminiscence of yesterday. They are found to be centuries old in every

instance where they can be traced. But they may be new—indeed, they almost necessarily are new—to the race in which at a given moment they are most effective. It is not possible that the meager dramatic tradition of England before Shakespeare's time—including the religious and artisan plays of the Middle Ages, the rhapsodic recitation of poetic tales, the Latin plays of the schools, the representation of a few comedies beginning, with *Gammer Gurton's Needle* a few years before Shakespeare was born, and of certain tragedies, *Ferrex and Porrex* or *Gorboduc* and the like, so sharply satirized by Sir Philip Sydney—was the sole resource of English actors and audiences when the true drama came into being. True it is that from the outset, even where the old religious drama only was concerned, English actors of every grade were paid for their services—better paid than the minor clergy; and that the tendency was to create a professional class, instead of loading the stage with multitudes chosen at random from the population, as was the practice in other countries. Nevertheless the transition from the mediaeval religious or guild play to the real drama, even when the latter was represented by the clumsy work of Shakespeare's predecessors, was a difficult thing. We have evidence of this much later on the German stage, where the movement occurred in the clear light of observation and

history. Germany was as early familiar with the religious play as either France or England. But the whole process of the development of her favorite passion-play was rather adverse than favorable to the making of actors. There was no unity of time, place, or person in the passion-play, no character—nothing but a symbolic setting-forth of human history with its culmination in the death and resurrection of the Savior. The writers and performers of the secular drama had to pass from this symbolism to the delineation of human life. They might have effected this transition from mediaeval to modern ideas of dramatic writing and acting without help. As a matter of fact, they did not work out the problem for themselves. They were taught by the English actors and playwrights. The titles, cast, and plots of the great majority of early English dramas show that what England gave to Germany she had herself received from Italy. In fact, what the various nations of the West were now learning had never been forgotten by the Greeks. The dramatic tradition never disappeared even for a moment from its earliest home in Europe. The importance of a fact of this kind is illustrated by Carlyle's allusion to the unrecorded lore of the smithy. This continuity of a tradition handed on from one living man to another is a very different thing from the recovery of a literary form by the study of

long-forgotten books. With respect to many forms of literature traditions were kept alive throughout mediaeval western Europe by constant practice. In other cases—for example, in the uninterrupted series of one or two men in each generation who kept alive the study of the Greek language—there is proof that Hellenic culture was never out of reach. This helps to explain why it is that, whenever we find a new dramatic movement in the West down to the final subversion of the Byzantine Empire, we always discover good cause for mentioning Athens or Constantinople.

We may talk as much as we like about independent literary origins. The simple fact is that there has never been anything of the kind within the historical period. When the genealogical tree of the drama shall have been made out, it will be found that the rural Dionysiac festival of Greece is only one of its roots. Others will be found to spring from the wild Phrygian dances, from Egyptian tale-telling and temple ceremony, from the Babylonian lament for Tammuz, and from an Assyrian or Semitic literary form represented now only by the Song of Songs. The trunk of the tree belongs to the Greeks, because they gave to literature what had been merely religious, reduced an irregular growth to symmetrical proportions, and in place of endless allegories substituted the interaction of personalities that were

real to the fancy, if not to history. The Romans did hardly more than inscribe their name on this Greek trunk; for they added almost nothing to the comedy as it came to them, and used tragedy only as a closet exercise. Other nations in Roman times did nothing more, from Spain to Parthia, than to listen to the Greek drama, the sweetest words they had ever heard, and to pay almost divine honors to Greek actors. The earliest branch of the Greek tree was the Sanskrit-Prakrit tragicomedy of India, from which the curious drama of China was certainly derived subsequent to the activity of the Buddhist missionaries. In the West the main trunk was successively Hellenic, Roman, Hellenistic, Byzantine, Italian. In the Hellenistic period there was a branch, the Christian drama, which still survives in the passion-play. In the Byzantine period branched off the ecclesiastical theater, the Morality, and the Mystery. In the Italian period, beginning about a generation before the fall of Constantinople, the whole long-lived tradition of the drama and the stage was transferred to western Europe. It branched almost immediately into the Italian, Spanish, and English theater. From the Italian stem rose the modern Greek drama; from the Spanish, the French comedy; from the English, the German. Such would be approximately what a complete analysis of the history of the drama must show.

INDEX

INDEX

Abecedary, 76.
Abelard, 182, 195, 206.
Abra, daughter of Hilary of Poitiers, 32.
Abraham, play by Roswitha, 171.
Accius, 263.
Acephalians, 43.
Acerra, 267.
Acersecomes, title of Dionysus, applied to John the Baptist, 58.
Acharnians, 74.
Achilles, 122, 291, 296.
Achilles Tatius, 131.
Acolythia, 176.
Acta of the Hippodrome, 41, 45.
Actors, 14, 26, 107.
Actresses, 27, 28.
"Ad coeli clara," hymn, 78.
Adam, character in play by Ignatius, 256.
Adam, play of, 182.
Adelaide (Adelheid) empress, 155.
Adolphus, fables of, 184, 288.
Adoratio Christi, 58.
Advice of Menander, 77.
Aeneas Gazaeus, 11, 89.
Aeschylus, 25, 69, 116.
Agamemnon, 292.
Agape, 170.
Agathias, collector of epigrams, 100.
Agesilaus, 86.
Agnes, 164.
Ahrens, 297, 299.
Aimoin, 184.
Ἀκολυθία, 176, 177.
Alberic, 188.
Albericus, 183.
Albigenses, 186.
Alcaeus, the dramatist, 74.
Alcmena, as character in plays, 197, 200.
Alcman, 76.
Alcuin, 322.
Alda, Comedy of, 295; character of, 298.
Alderspach, 167.
Aldhelm, 79.
Alexander and Darius, play of, by butchers' guild, 116, 117.
Alexander Natalis cited, 151.
Alexandria, theaters of, 33.
Alphabetary, 76.
"Altercation" between Canossa and Mantua, 204.
Aminta in Greek, 202.
Amphitryo, 197.
Amphitryon, character in Plautus, 195; in play of *Geta*, 196; as character in Seneca, 316.
Anastasius, emperor, 43, 86, 87, 145.
Anastasius, pope, 164.
ἀνδρόγυνος, hypothetical title of play, 301.
Andromache, 292.
Andronicus, emperor, 82.
ἀνδρόθηλυς, hypothetical name of play, 300.
ἀνδρόπαις, hypothetical name of play, 301.
ἀνδροπάρθενος, hypothetical name of play, 300.
Angelo Politiano, 117.
Anger, Seneca's treatise on, 315.
Anna Comnena, account of stage satires by, 115.
Anselm, 182, 194.
Anthemius, emperor, 144, 148.
Anthology, 78, 98.
Anthusa, a dancer, 100.
Antichrist, 43, 182.

Anticlea, 272.
Antigone, 73.
Antioch, 36, 74, 94, 95, 116.
Antiochus, 29.
Antiphanes, 303.
"Antiphonary of Bangor," 79.
Antithalia, 31.
Anus, character in play of *Pamphilus*, 201.
Aphrodite, 303.
Apocalypse, the, as picture of its time, 315.
Ἀπόκρεες, 112.
Ἀποκρέω, 21.
Apollinarii, dramas of, 68.
Apollo, 39, 292.
Apollonius Rhodius, 199.
Apologues, natural dialogue in, 183.
Ἀπόθημος φιλία, compared to farce by Nicole de la Chesnaye, 110.
Apuleius, 170.
Aquinas, St. Thomas, 3.
Arabia, hymns in, 31.
Arcadius, emperor, 73.
Arcas, name of character in play of *Geta*, 199.
ἀρχαιολόγοι, 113.
Ares, 202.
Ariadne, empress, 86, 145.
Arians, 30, 35, 38, 43, 144, 175.
Arician priesthood, 236.
Aristophanes, 74, 91, 105, 140.
Arius, 30, 37.
Armenians, love of, for Greek tragedy, 143.
Arthur, king, 290; legends, 200; romances, 237.
Ascalon, athletes of, 11.
Ashley, W. J., 187.
Asiarch, 258.
"A solus ortus cardine ad usque," hymn, 78.
Asses, feast of, 56, 59.
Atella, 267.
Atellana, 264.
Atellanae, 264, 306.
Athanasius, 30.
Athenais, maiden name of Eudocia, 81.
Athens, the home of comedy, 80.
Attic middle comedy revived, 90.
Atto, duke of Canossa, 204.
Augustine, 53, 78.
Aulularia, 183, 189.
Ausonius, 238.
Autolycus, 268, 271, 272, 282, 291, 293.
Auxentius, 37.
A Winter's Tale, 273, 283.
Ayrer, German dramatist who imitated the English method, 132.

Babio, drama of thirteenth century, 202.
Babrius, 184.
Bacchus, 21, 108, 249.
Bacon, Roger, 188.
Ballads, Homeric, 120; of the mediaeval period, 119.
Balsamon, patriarch of Antioch, 58, 62, 105.
Balzac, 218, 296.
Barbarians praised by Chrysostom, 12.
Barda, Leo, 77.
Bardesanes, 36.
Barlaam, 289.
Basil, bishop of Seleucia, 83.
Basil, emperor, 63.
Basil the Great, friendly to theater, 9, 34, 35, 119, 175.
Basilides, 75.
Bassaris, female stage name, 100.
Bathed Aminta, the, 130.
Battle Abbey, chronicle of, cited, 165.
Baucis, character in comedy, 201.
Baume, St., pilgrims to the shrine of, 60.
Bayle, 112.
Bebelius Henricus, 140.
Bede the Venerable, 79, 248, 277, 322.
Beggar-literati, 452.
Behn, Aphra, 287.
Beirut, actors of, 10.
Beneti of the Hippodrome, 41.

Ben-Hur, 253.
Benoît de St. Maur, 120.
"Ben venga primavera," 117.
Berengar of Tours, 182.
Bergk, Th., 270.
Bernard (Bernward), 153.
Bernard of Chartres, 235.
Bibbiena, cardinal, his comedy, 125.
βιολόγοι, 113.
Bion, 296.
Birrhia, character in play of *Geta*, 198, 201.
Birrhus, 198.
Blachernae, church of the, 54.
Blasius, 164.
Boccaccio, 122, 289, 291, 295, 310.
Boddhisatva, 290.
Bodo, 165, 167.
Boëthius, 123, 147, 247, 252.
Boissonade, 10, 19, 76, 82, 149, 256.
βομβονάρια, 115.
Boniface, Saxon missionary, 19.
Bossuet, 34.
Bouvy, 35.
Boy bishop, the, 59.
Brambs, J. G., 71.
Brocquière, 254, 260.
Brumalia, 47, 52.
Bruno, archbishop, 172, 174, 180, 191.
Brutus, character in Roman plays, 266, 284.
Brydges, Sir Edgerton, 112, 128.
Bucco, character in Atellan farce, 268, 306.
Budaeus, 107.
Buddha, 290.
Bunsen, baron, 175.
Burrus, character in Roman plays, 268.
Butchers' hippodrome, 118.
Byron, 296, 322.
Byzantine literature not exclusively Hellenic in origin, 318.
Byzantines, 42, 63, 138, 143, 150, 156, 166, 254, 256, 261, 289, 305, 319.
Byzantium, 64, 82, 144, 154, 166, 192, 197, 262, 290, 305.
Byzantine mimes, teachers of Italy, 133.

Caecilius Statius, 301.
Caesar of Heisterbach, 154, 207.
Caesarea, pantomimists of, 10.
Calandae, 47, 105.
Calandra, 126.
Calderon, 84, 287.
Calends, 15, 17, 19.
Callimachus, play by Roswitha, 169.
Callisto, mythical mother of Arcas, 199.
Campbell, J. F., 184.
Canossa, 204.
Canterbury Tales, The, 287.
Canticles, drama from, 34.
Capatius, 207.
Capnio, Latinized name of Reuchlin, 139.
Cappadocia, 11, 21, 31.
Caramalloi, 85.
Caramallus, a dancer, 100.
Caramalus, male stage name, 144.
Carlyle, 332.
Carnival, the, at Byzantium, 21.
Cassiodorus, theatrical decree, prepared by, for Theodoric, 148.
Castavetia, rope dancers of, 11.
Catherine Cornaro, 126.
Catherine, St., play of, 61.
Cedrenus, 57.
Celtes, first editor of Roswitha, 139.
Cervantes, 18.
Cesena, dialogue of, 216.
χάνη, 306.
Charicle, name of mimad, 100.
Charity, character in Roswitha's drama, 172.
Charlemagne, 59, 106, 150, 179, 321.
Charos (Charon), 202.
Chassang, 320, 325.
Chaucer, 122, 183, 187, 217, 265, 287, 319, 328.
Children's Crusade, the, 188.
Chione, 271.
Chionia, 170.

Choricius, 22, 89, 93, 262, 294.
Chosroes, Antioch of, 95.
Christ in gnostic legend, 49; impersonated in a Byzantine play, 54.
Christ, W., 179, 254.
Christian dramas inferior, 68.
Christianity, triumph of, over theater, 9.
Christine, duchess of Lorraine, dramatic eulogy of, 112.
Christmas in Byzantium, 20.
Χριστὸς πάσχων, 68, 104.
Christus Patiens, 71, 253.
Chrysargyrion, tax of the, 88.
Χρυσεόμαλλος, male stage name, 98.
Chrysomalloi, 85.
Chrysostom, 9, 12, 24, 27, 29, 33, 35, 114, 150, 175, 264, 302, 304.
Church, in opposition to theater, 3; drama, 181.
Cicero, 301.
Cleophantis, feminine stage name, 100.
Cleseis, games at Antioch, 21.
Cletoria, at Constantinople. 21.
Cloetta, 123, 149, 191, 201, 235, 261, 286, 295, 309.
Clytaemnestra, mediaeval Greek tragedy of, 308.
Coelius Sedulius, 78.
Comedies, audiences at, in Byzantium, 93.
Comedy, Latin, rare in imperial times, 3.
Comedy of Alda, 295.
Comedy of Errors, 268.
Comedy of Lydia, 286, 289, 296.
Commodian, 78.
Comoedia togata, 266.
Constantia, character in Roswitha's drama, 168.
Constantine, character in Roswitha's drama, 168.
Constantine Monomachus, 109.
Constantine Porphyrogenitus, 53, 63, 108, 116.
Constantine the grammarian, 119.
Constantine the Great, 35, 88, 193, 318.
Constantine VIII, 57, 160.
Constantinople, 31, 62, 124, 139, 261, 264, 290, 294, 326.
Constantius, 10, 35.
Contes drolatiques, 296.
Cora, character in Greek idyl, 299.
Cordax, dance abolished by the emperor Anastasius, 145.
Corona, martyr, 205.
Council of Trent, 157.
Crates, 71.
Creizenach, 84, 167, 172, 309.
Creon, 73.
Cretan theater, 202.
Croceus, character in comedy of *Babio*, 203.
Crotalum, the, in the isles of Greece, 116.
Crusaders at Constantinople, 62.
Crutwell, 263.
Cuckoo, the, in English poetry, 278.
Cynegia, 47.
Cynegion, 96.
Cyprian, St., 53, 83, 157.
Cyrano de Bergerac, 269.
Cyril, 85.
Cyrus, St., 23.

Daedalion, 271.
Dancers defended by Libanius, 74.
Danse macabre, 18.
Dante, 123, 138, 266, 309.
Daphnis, character in a dialogic poem by Bede, 248; in a Greek idyl, 299.
Dares, 120.
Davidic melody, 36.
Davus, character in Latin comedy, 201.
Débats, 242.
Decameron, 289.
Decius, character in Roman plays, 266, 284; in *Comedy of Lydia*, 286, 293.
Decreta canonica, 106.
Deidamia, 291, 297.
Delphi, 39.

De Milone, 294.
De miraculis occultis, 92.
Demo, feminine stage name, 100.
Demosthenes, 90.
De nugis curialium, 240.
De parricida, title of mediaeval tragedy, 235.
Desiderius, abbot of Monte Cassino, 183.
Dexippus, 80.
Diana, 199.
Dictys, 120.
Dietrich of Berne, legend of, 148.
Dio Chrysostom, 38.
Diocletian, emperor, 95, 172.
Diomedes, grammarian, 265, 291, 293, 305.
Dionysia, 16, 47, 52.
Dionysiacs, the, 28.
Dionysius, St., 164; the Areopagite, 322.
Dionysus abrocomus, 85.
Diphilus, 71.
Ditmarus, 17, 154, 155, 158.
Don Juan, King of Arragon, 186.
Don Juan, 296.
Don Quixote, 18.
Doris, name of mimad, 100.
Dorotheus, 87.
Dorsenus, character in Roman folk plays, 268.
Douce, 18.
Dreams, The Three, a dramatization, 202.
Drusiana, character in Roswitha, 170.
Du Bartas, 253.
Duffield, 32, 78.
Dulcitius, character in Roswitha, 169.
Dulorestès, character in Roman plays, 284.
Du Meril, 184, 187, 202, 294, 295, 299.
Dunstable, play of *St. Catherine* performed at, 137.
Duns Scotus, 206, 327.
Dunstan, 153.
Dupouy, 110.
Easter dialogues, 174, 180.
Eberhard of Bethune, 287.
Ebert, 142, 187.
Eccerinis, tragedy by Mussato, 310.
ἦχος, 178.
Edith, empress, 155.
ᾠδοναι, 116.
Education of women at era of Reformation, 141.
εἱρμός, 177.
ἐκφράσεις, 83.
Elevatio crucis, 58.
Ἑλλαδίη, feminine stage name, 98.
England, hymns in, 33; diatribes against theater in, 3.
English, dramatic tendency of the, 329.
Eosphorus, 271.
Ephrem Syrus, 36.
Erigena, 322, 325.
Ero, character in story by Walter Mapes, 221.
Erophile, Cretan tragedy, 202, 309.
Erōtus (Eros), 202.
Etruria, 267.
Euclio, character in Plautus, 189, in the play of *Querolus*, 190.
Eudocia, empress, 39, 71, 80, 83, 119.
Eulenspiegel, 203.
Eumalloi, 85.
Eumonia, character in Plautus, 190.
Euripides, 44, 58, 68, 73, 90, 106.
Eurypalus, 291.
Eustathius of Thessalonica, 114.
Eutyches, 41.
Eutychians, 43.
Eutychianus, 182.
Evagrius, 86.
Eve, character in play by Ignatius, 256.
Everardus, 159.
Ezzelino da Romano, 310.
Fabliaux, 288, 315.
Fabricius, 67, 118, 194, 252.
Fairs in Europe from early times, 59.

Faith, character in Roswitha, 172.
Farseurs, 107.
Faust, 253.
Feast of Roses, 119.
Ferrex and Porrex, 331.
Fescenninae, 267.
Fifth Veda, 285.
Fitzstephen, 137.
Flaurus and Marcus, tragedy of, 295.
Florence, carnival at, 18.
Fodius, character in comedy of *Babio*, 203.
Folk-poets in Byzantium, 119.
Fools, feast of, 54, 56, 59.
Forcellini, 191.
Fortunate Shoemaker, The, tale by Walter Mapes, 239.
Fortunatus, character in Roswitha's drama, 171.
Fredegisus, 194.
Frederick II, emperor, 151, 206.
Freere, 45, 178.
Furness, 132.

Gado, character in story by Mapes, 237.
Galatea, feminine stage name, 100.
Galathea, character in play of *Pamphilus*, 201.
Gallicanus, comedy by Roswitha, 167.
Galotto, 128.
Galo, character in story by Walter Mapes, 220.
Gammer Gurton's Needle, 331.
Gandersheim, 162, 165, 167.
Gaucelm Faidit, 186.
Gaurodas, 131.
Gautier, 45, 177, 178, 185.
Gaza, declaimers, of, 11; acroamatic art of, 101.
Genealogical tree of the drama, 333.
Genealogies of the gods, 289.
Genesius, 61.
Gennadius, 15.
Geoffrey of Monmouth, 200, 288.
Gerald of Barri, 218, 240.
Gerberg II, abbess of Gandersheim, 161.
Gerbert, 183.
Gerloh von Reichersberg, 181, 182.
Germans, festivals of, 16.
Germany, prosperity of, under the Saxon House, 151; early development of drama in, 332.
Gesius (Gesus), 24.
Gesta Romanorum, 236.
Geta, play by Vitalis, 191, character, mentioned by Sedulius, 193.
Gian Briocci, 269.
Gibbon, 187.
Giles, 200.
Giraldi, 309.
Glass, H. A., 12, 33.
Glyceria, 201.
Glycerium, character in comedy, 201.
Gnostics, 50, 75.
Goliards, 60.
Gomberville, 327.
Gorboduc, 252, 331.
Gorlois, 200.
Gosson, 3.
Gower, 122, 255, 299, 300.
Graal, 237.
Graeco-Venetian jargon, 126.
Greek hymnology, all acrostical, 80.
Greek novelists, the, 129.
Greek stage tradition, 123.
Greeks, fondness of, for the play, 105.
Gregory Nazianzen, not unfriendly to the stage, 9, 29, 68; quoted, 67.
Gregory of Nyssa, 9.
Gregory, St., 81, 119.
Gregory V, pope, 151.
Grosvenor, E. A., 117.
Guarini, 129.
Guido of Arezzo, 205.
Guido of Colonna, 121.
Gulistan, 239.
γύναιδρος, 300.
Gunzo of Novara, 183.
Gyparis, Cretan comedy, 202.

Hamlet, 188.
Harlequin, 284.
Hatto, bishop, 324.
Hawkins, 18.
Hazlitt, 60, 137, 186.
Hector, 292.
Helen, 292.
Helenus, 292.
Heliopolis, choraulists of, 11.
Henry, the fowler, 150, 324.
Henry II, king of England, 32, 219, 240.
Henry VII, emperor, 310.
Heracles, 86.
Heraclius, emperor, 102.
Hercules, 122, 197, 200.
Hercules furens, 316.
Heresy of the Fathers, the, satirical dialogue by Gauceim Faidit, 186.
Heretics favored the stage, 74.
Hermes, 271, 282.
Hermione, 292.
Hermonassa, feminine stage name, 100.
Herod play, 54, 166.
Herostratus, 5.
Herrad of Landsperg, 55.
Hetaera, 28.
Hilary of Poitiers, 32, 78.
Hildebert, 295.
Hippodrome, 8, 15, 40, 42, 45, 47, 57, 62, 81, 83, 85, 96, 102, 105, 114, 117, 160.
Hirena, 170.
Historia de bello Trojano, of Guido, 121.
Histriones, 59, 106, 107.
Hohenstaufen, 150.
Holbein, 18.
Holland, hymns in, 33.
Holm, A., 238.
Homer, 24, 120, 290.
Honorius, emperor, 73, 146.
Hope, character in Roswitha's drama, 172.
Horace, 189, 296.
Howleglasse, 203.
Hueffer, F. M., 184.
Huet, abbé, 112.
Huss, 327.
Hyginus, 199, 271.
Hypatia, 38.
Hypocrisy (ὑπόκρισις), 149.

Iconoclasm (Iconoclasts, etc.), 44, 46, 49, 52, 54, 102, 106.
Ἴδε τὸ ἔαρ τὸ καλόν, κ. τ. λ., 117.
ἱερὸν ἀγῶνα, 82.
Igerna, 200.
Ignatius, 77, 104, 254, 256.
Indian idyl, 250.
Innocent III, 206.
Innocent, St., 164.
Interlude in renaissance Greek plays, 28.
Irenaeus, 72.
Isaozites, theme of tragedy by Menander the Protector, 102.
Isidore of Pelusium, 25.
Isidore of Seville, 79, 123.
ἰσοκρατοῦντες, 179.
ἴσον, 179.
Italy, hymns in, 33; Latin classicalism of, 45; opposition of, to ecclesiastical drama, 61.

James, St., of Compostella, 60.
Jason, 122.
Jenks, E., 323.
Jerome, St., 175.
Jerome of Prague, 327.
Jesuit dramas, 310.
Joannes Geometra, 78.
Joculatores, 107.
Jongleur, 305.
John Argyropulos, 122.
John Cantacuzene, 111.
John Lydus, 264.
John of Damascus, 68, 104, 194, 290, 302, 322.
John Palaeologus, 112.
John, St., 23, 49, 163.
John, St., of Euchania, 58.
John the Baptist, 58.
John XII, pope, 151, 242.
Jonson, Ben, 128, 309.
Josaphat, St., 290.

Joueurs de farses, 107.
Jourdain, 183.
Journeys of the Apostles, 49.
Judas Iscariot, 116.
Julian, emperor, 8, 36, 39, 67, 73, 106, 168.
Julian, St., 61.
Jumièges, abbey of, 178.
Juno, as a character in Seneca, 316.
Justin, church father, 20.
Justin, emperor, 95.
Justinian, emperor, 27, 46, 53, 81, 83, 95, 96, 98, 115, 148, 294.
Justinian II, 46.

Kimchi, David, 140.
King of Asia, character in story by Walter Mapes, 221.
Klinkhamer, 189.
Klopstock, 253.
κοίμησις, 113.
Kontopaikte, a pike or pole dance, 106.
κούλουμα, 21.
Krumbacher, 5, 35, 70, 102, 256.
κυλίστρας, 81.
Kurth, G., 146.

Lactantius, against the stage, 4.
Laelius Aristides, 90.
Laertes, 272.
Lais, feminine stage name, 100; character in story by Walter Mapes, 221.
Lamb, C., 189.
λαμπαδάριος, 178.
Lampadarius, 179.
Lanfranc, 182.
Lange, 174.
Laodicea, charioteers of, 10.
Latin student poems, 60.
Leibnitz, 92, 165, 173, 207, 216.
Leland, C. G., 151.
Le miracle de Théophile, 182.
Leo I, emperor, 42, 63, 85.
Leo X, pope, 125.
Leontius, 81, 289.
Levinus Lemnius, 92.
Leyser, 184, 187, 287.
Libania, feminine stage name, 100.
Libanius, 9, 74, 90.
Liber Tragoediae, of Nestorius, 72.
Libya, hymns in, 31.
Light of the World, 253.
Limoges, early mysteries at, 137.
Lipsius, R. A., 49.
Liturgies, 175.
Liutprandus, 156.
Lizelius, 140.
London, religious plays at, in twelfth century, 137.
Longus, 131.
Lorenzo de' Medici, 117.
Loserth, 18.
Lowth, 34.
Lucan, 199, 314.
Lucian, 170, 198, 315.
Lucius Piso, 315.
Ludolph, prince, 155.
Ludwig the Pious, emperor, 173.
Lupercalia, 47, 118.
Lusores, 106.
Luther, 327.
Lycidas, character in Greek idyl, 297.
Lycomedes, king of Scyros, 291, 296.
Lycomedes, legendary painter, 49.
Lyconides, character in Plautus, 189.
Lycophron, 69, 109.
Lydgate, 252, 260, 265.
Lydia, comedy of, 286, 291.
Lydus, John, 264.

Macchabaeorum chorea, 18.
Maccus, character in Atellan farce, 268, 271, 306.
Macedonius, bishop, 193.
Macrobius, 19.
Magico prodigioso, 84.
Magnin, 104, 167.
Maine, Sir Henry, 263.
μακελλαρικὸν ἱπποδρόμιον, 118.

μακκώ, 269.
Malvolio, character in Shakespeare, 6.
Manichaeans, 43.
Manitius, 32, 76.
Manly, J. M., 191.
Manto, character in *Oedipus* of Seneca, 312.
Mantua, 204.
Manuel Phile, 264.
Mapes, Walter, 217, 237, 242.
Marbode, 182.
Marcellus, character in Roman plays, 266, 284.
March, F. A., 32, 78.
Margarito, feminine stage name, 28.
Marcian, emperor, 41.
Maria, character in Roswitha, 171.
Maria, feminine stage name, 100.
Mariamne, in gnostic legends, 51.
Marienklage, 70.
Marot, Clément, 32.
Marseilles, Greek theater of, 143.
Martial, 25, 299, 304, 314.
Martyrs, the four hundred, 54.
Mary Magdalene, 28.
Maswich, 199.
Mathematicus, title of play, 235.
Matilda, duchess of Canossa, 204, 206.
Matteo di Porta, archbishop of Salerno, 121.
Matthew of Vendôme, 61, 286, 289, 294, 305.
Maurice, emperor, 54, 101, 114.
Maximus, the cynic, 29.
Maximus Planudes, 19, 149.
Medea, character in Seneca, 314.
Megadorus, character in Plautus, 190.
Megara, character in Seneca, 316.
Meleager, collector of epigrams, 100.
Menander, 8, 27, 63, 68, 74, 91, 167, 198, 299, 302.
Menander, the protector, 101, 300.
Menecratis, feminine stage name, 100.
Menelaus, 292.
Menippus, of Lucian, 315.
Merchant's Tale, The, 275, 289.
Methodius, 68.
Meursius, 35.
Michael Cerullarius, 58.
Michaud, 188.
Middle Comedy censured, 93.
Milan, dialogue of, 215.
Militarius, 182.
Milton, 253.
Mimads, 28, 43.
Mimes condemned, 47.
μίμοι, 114.
Minor, T. C., 110.
Miracle play, 61.
Miskodeed, 251.
Mitford, 252.
Moechi, play by Antiphanes, 303.
Moechus, play by Philemon, 303.
Mohammed, 31.
Molière, 287.
Mondion, 43.
Moneta, 218.
Montfaucon, 302.
Mount St. Michael, 60.
Mullenbach, 191.
Müller, Max, 12.
Mussato, 137, 139, 187, 309, 312, 316.
Mutius, 151.
Myrson, character in Greek idyl, 297.
Mystery, 61, 255.

Naevius, 266.
Natalis, Alexander, 20, 23.
Nativity, Greek play of the, 254.
Neander, 72, 315.
Nebuchadnezzar, 254.
Neoplatonists favored by Emperor Anthemius, 144.
Neoptolemus, 291.
Nero, 311.
Nestorius, 41, 72.
Neumann, 52, 150, 158, 197.
Nicaea, council of, 44.
Nicephorus Basilaces, 111, 300.
Nicephorus Chumnus, 149.

Nicephorus, prefect, 304.
Nicostratus, character in Boccaccio, 291.
Nilus, 25, 77.
Niphon, patriarch, 149.
Nonnus, bishop, 28, 85, 119.
Northbrooke, 3.
Notker, 177, 180.
"Nutbrown Maid, The," 119; parodied, 33.

Οαριστούς, 299.
Ockham, 206, 327.
Octavius (Pope John XII), 242.
Odilo, 155.
Oedipus, 235, 252.
Oenomaeus, 73.
Oesterley, 221.
Officium stellae, 58.
Old Homestead, The, 201.
Olivetus, 112, 218.
Ollo, character in story by Walter Mapes, 237.
Oman, C., 152.
Ongaro, 129, 130.
Ὀνοϑρίαμβος, name of Greek mediaeval play, 300.
Ophis, character in play by Ignatius, 257.
Oppian, 309.
Orbecchi, tragedy of, by Giraldi, 309.
ὄρχησις, 114.
Orestes, 292.
Otto I, emperor, 154, 163, 172, 183, 323.
Otto II, emperor, 156, 162, 163, 164.
Otto III, emperor, 150, 151, 158, 160, 321.
Otto IV, emperor, 154, 206.
Ovid, 121, 189, 192, 199, 239, 272, 291, 292, 296, 303, 310.

Παικτολέ μον, 111.
Palaemon, character in Bede's ecologue, 249.
Palaeologi, period of the, 112.
Palestine, 31, 60.
Palliata, 284.
Pamphilus, play of, 201.
Παφίη, feminine stage name, 100.
Paphnutius, play by Roswitha, 169, 171.
Pappus, character in Atellan farces, 268, 306.
Παραδισοπλαστία, name of Greek play, 300.
Paranikas, M., 179, 254.
Paris, church in, built by minstrels, 60.
Parthenia, 76.
Παρϑενοσανδρεῖα, hypothetical title for Greek play, 300.
Pasiphaë, 74.
Passion play, 253.
Paul, St., 7, 168.
Paul the Silentiary, 83.
Paulinus and Polla, dramatic tale in verse, 202.
Paulus Diaconus, 182.
Paulus Perusinus, 290.
Pearson, Karl, 16, 18, 50, 54, 61, 70, 131, 142.
Peboan, Indian name of spirit of winter, 251.
Pecula, character in play of *Babio*, 203.
Pedagogues not permitted to attend the comedy, 93.
Peiper, 173, 189, 191, 200, 201, 276, 300, 301.
Pelagius, 28, 164.
Perdita, character in Shakespeare, 283.
Περὶ Αὐτεξουσίου, 75.
Pericles Prince of Tyre, 255.
Perizonius, 139.
Persia, 82.
Persianes, Antonius, funeral drama by, 112.
Pertz, 173.
Peter of Blois, 252.
Peter, St., in gnostic legends, 51.
Petrarch, 216.
Petronius, 314.
Phabaton, male stage name, 144.
Phaedra, Seneca's tragedy of, 314.
Phaedria, character in Plautus, 189.
Phile, 71, 111, 114, 119.

Philemon, 71, 91, 303.
Φίλιννα, feminine stage name, 99.
Philistion, 25, 167.
Phillip Augustus, king of France, 207.
Phocas, emperor, 115.
Photius, 109.
Phrygia, 32.
Pilgrim, play of the, 182.
Pindar, 76, 140.
Pirkheimer, Bilibald, 140.
Pirkheimer, Charitas, 140.
Pisides, 119.
Pistorius, 207.
Planch de St. Esteve, 84.
Planipedaria, 264, 283.
Plato, 75, 204, 217.
Plato, citharist, 100.
Plautus, 124, 188, 189, 193, 195, 196, 199, 252, 262, 264, 266, 284.
Players at fairs, 60.
Plonnigen, Theodore de, 140.
Pliny, 53.
Plochiras, 103.
Plutarch, 315.
Πολέμων, male stage name, 99.
Polichinelle, 269.
Polonius, 283.
Polychronius, the Apamacan, his play of the Canticles, 34.
Polydore Vergil, 19.
Pontanus, Isaac, 186.
Pope, plan of, for history of poetry, 252.
Πόρνη, 28.
Porphyris, feminine stage name, 100.
Practica, of councils, 41, 47, 55.
Praetextata, 284.
Prasini, of the Hippodrome, 41.
Priam, 292.
Price, 84.
Priest and Logician, goliardic poem of the, 217.
Prince of the House of David, 253.
Prior, Matthew, 119.
Proba, 71.
Procopius of Gaza, 120.
Procopius, historian, 22, 89, 95.
Prodromus, title of John the Baptist, 58.
Prosa, 44.
Proterius, 164.
Protopsaltes, 179.
Πρωτοψάλτης, 178.
Provence, 184, 268.
Prudentius, 312.
Prynne, 3.
Psellus, 109, 114.
Ptochoprodromus, 71.
Ptolemy Philadelphus, 30, 82.
Pulcinella, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271.
Pulcinellate, 270.
Punch and Judy, 265, 269, 284.
Putschius, 265.
Pyrrha, character in *Comedy of Alda*, 299.
Pyrrhias, 198.
Pyrrhus, 198, 268, 271, 283, 286, 291, 293, 296.

Queen of Asia, character in story by Walter Mapes, 221.
Querolus, an imitation of Plautus, 188.
Querolus, character in the play of *Querolus*, 190.

Rabelais, 195.
Radewin, 182.
Rashdall, H., 82.
Raynouard, 84.
Regino, 155.
Reginus, bishop, 205.
Reine, St., pilgrims to the shrine of, 60.
Renaissance, 124, 282.
Renan, 35.
Reuchlin, 139.
Rhinthonice, 264, 283.
Rhodoclea, feminine stage name, 100.
Rhodope, feminine stage name, 100.
Rikkardis, 162.
Ripheus, 239.
Rivius, character in story by Walter Mapes, 221.
Robert, king of Jerusalem, 290.

Robin and Marion, 182.
'Ροδάνθη, feminine stage name, 99.
Romaic as name of modern Greek language, 322.
Romanus, composer, 35, 42, 44, 254.
Romanus I, Lacapenus, 53, 56, 161.
Rome, attempt to revive theater, 144.
Romulus, 53.
Ronca, U., 150, 154, 158, 183, 216.
Roscellin, 195.
Roscius, 145, 265.
Roscoe, 117, 126.
Ross, Alexander, 71.
Roswitha, 138, 139, 141, 142, 161, 162, 163, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, 172, 174, 181, 182, 183, 308, 317.
Ruotger (Ruotgerus), 155, 172.
Rustic Comedy, modern, 284.
Ruzante, the *Rhodiana* of, 126.

Sabina, an ideal character, 296.
Sadius, character in story by Walter Mapes, 220.
St. Catherine, play of, 137.
St. Denis, play of *St. Catherine* by monks of, 137.
St. Gall, abbey of, 178.
St. Martial, Mysteries at the church of, 137.
St. Nicholas, play of, 182.
St. Sophia, church of, 56, 62, 83, 105, 254, 255, 256.
Salerno, the last refuge of Greek vernacular in the West, 121.
Salmasius, 112.
Salomon, 185.
Sannazaro, 128.
Sapientia, play of, by Roswitha, 169.
Sappho, feminine stage name, 100.
Sappho, stanza of, imitated, 140.
Sardana, character in the play of *Querolus*, 191, 192.
Sardinia, 192.
Σαρδώ, 192.
Sathas, Constantine N., 5, 6, 7, 9, 11, 17, 18, 22, 23, 27, 29, 35, 36, 37, 47, 50, 54, 67, 75, 80, 89, 98, 113, 118, 126, 137, 150, 202, 267, 284, 309, 302, 306, 309, 310.
Sceva, character in story by Walter Mapes, 237.
Schneekind, 187.
Schoolcraft, 250.
Scotland, hymns of, 32.
Scott, Dr. Jonathan, 285, 289.
Scylitses, 62.
Secundinus, 78.
Sedulius, 71, 192, 194, 197.
Seegwun, Indian name for the spirit of spring, 251.
Selborne, earl of, 35, 78.
Seleucus VI, 100.
Seneca, 183, 252, 262, 287, 307, 308, 309, 310, 311, 312, 314.
Sequentia, 176.
Servius, 199.
Severinus, 29.
Seymour, the three sisters, distichs in memory of Margaret of Valois by, 112.
Shakespeare, 5, 64, 122, 128, 129, 131, 168, 188, 189, 261, 268, 273, 282, 287, 293, 305, 309, 310, 327.
Shaw, John, 199.
Sibylline acrostic, 78.
Sidonius, Apollinaris, 145.
Sigebert, 156.
Sisyphus, 272.
σκηνικοί, 114.
Slavery in mediaeval Europe, 187.
Smith, Captain John, 327.
Snow Boy, The, 187.
Soccus, the, 283.
Socrates, 217.
Sophia, princess and abbess, 156, 159, 162, 164, 166.
Sophist contests, 82.
Sophocles, 8, 25, 63, 73, 110, 124, 131, 140, 309.
Sophonisba, tragedy of, by Trissino, 128, 309.
Sophronius, 179.
Sotades, 30.
Southey, 84.
Sozomen, 67.
Spaniards, early love of the, for Greek tragedy, 143.
Spectator, The, 303.
Spring and winter, dialogue between, in Bede's verse, 243; in Red Indian lore, 250.

Spurca, character of in *Comedy of Alda*, 299.
Spurius, character in *Comedy of Alda*, 299.
Stage names in Byzantium, 26.
Stathēs, title of Cretan play, 202.
Statius, 121, 263.
Στεφανίτα, title of mediaeval Greek play, 300.
Stephen Sabaites, 104.
Stilbe, mythological name, 271.
Stilicho, 73.
Strobilus, character in Plautus, 190.
Struvius, 207.
Stubbs, 3.
Student plays, 81.
Στύπαξ, title of mediaeval Greek play, 300.
Suidas, 80.
Susanna, subject of play by John of Damascus, 104.
Swallow song, Greek, 270.
Sylvester II, pope, 151.
Symposium of the Ten Virgins, the, 75.
Synesius, dramas of, 71, 119.
Syria, hymns in, 31; music of, 36; gratitude of, to Anastasius, 88.

Tableaux vivants, 260.
Tacitus, 315.
ταλαντοῦχος Ἑρμῆς, title of mediaeval Greek play, 300.
Tancred and Sigismunda, story of, by Boccaccio, 309.
Tangmarus, 153, 156.
Tasso, 129, 130, 202.
Telange, mythological name, 271.
Telesticha, 80.
Ten, decree of the Council of, 125.
Terence, 105, 166, 167, 172, 181, 182, 183, 193, 198, 199, 218, 219, 262, 263, 266, 284, 301, 317.
Thais, character in Roswitha, 171.
Θάλεια, feminine stage name, 98.
Thalia, title of Arian hymn book, 30.
Θάνατος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, 104.
θεάματα, 97.
Theano, feminine stage name, 100.
Theater as distinguished from circus, 3; condemned by Lactantius and St. Paul, 4; reduced animosity toward the, 9.
θέατρον, 83.
Theatrum, meaning of, in the tenth century, 150.
Thecla, legend of, 51, 83.
Thelwall, 287.
Themistius, 25.
Theocritus, 129, 131, 277, 296.
Theodora, empress, 26, 96, 97.
Theodore Anagnostes, 86.
Theodore Hyrtacenus, 82.
Theodore of Mopsuestia, 36.
Theodore Prodromus, 71, 77, 109, 111.
Theodoretus, 8, 73.
Theodoria, feminine stage name, 100.
Theodoric, king of the Goths in Italy, 145, 147, 148, 150, 151.
Theodosius the Great, emperor, 27, 53.
Theodosius the Younger, 38, 39, 40, 42, 73, 85, 115.
Theophano, German empress, 156, 158, 159, 160, 164, 165, 167.
Théophile, Le miracle de, 181.
Theophilus, emperor, 115, 306.
Theophilus, St., subject of poem by Roswitha, 164, 181.
Theophylact (Theophylactus), 54, 56, 161.
Theopolis, temporary name of Antioch, 95.
Theoric funds used for military purposes, 108.
Theos, character in play by Ignatius, 258.
Therapeutae, 33.
Therapon, character in a Greek mediaeval dialogue, 112.
Theseide, 289.
Theseus, character in Shakespeare, 261.
Thomas, St., gnostic epithalamium attributed to, 52.
Thompson, Denman, 201.

Thraso, comedy character, 201.
Three Hebrew Children, Mystery of, 254.
Thyestes, tragedy of, by Seneca, 309.
Tickell, 303.
Tiktousai, comedy by Menander, 74.
Timotheus of Gaza, 88.
Tiraqueau, 106.
Tiresias, character in Seneca's *Oedipus*, 312.
Tirrea Veda, 286.
Titinius, 266.
Tituros, masculine stage name, 98.
Tobias, book of, 289.
Toderini, 113.
Tomaschek, 52.
Togata tabernaria, 264.
Togatae, 293.
Townly Mysteries, 254.
Tozer, H. F., 116.
Trajan, 53.
Trissino, 128, 309.
Trivet, Nicholas, 252.
Troparia, 176.
τροπάριον, 176, 177.
τρόπος, 178.
Troubadours, Provençal, 186.
Trovadores, Spanish, 186.
Troy legend, the mediaeval, 120.
Truculentus, comedy of, by Plautus, 193.
Trullo, Council in, 23, 46, 52, 56, 81, 101, 105.
Turkish drama, 113.
Turner, Sharon, 153, 187.
Tutilon, first trope of, 177.
Twelfth Night, 6.
Tylor, E. B., 12.
Tyre, actors of, 10.
Tyrwhitt, 287.
Tzetzes, 71, 109, 110.

Ulfas, character in the comedy of *Alda*, 299.
Ulrich, Dr. J., 187.
Ulysses, 272.
Umbria, mediaeval festivities of, 20.
Unbended Knee, sect of the, 48.
Uther Pendragon, 200.

Vagabonds, 60.
Valentine, the Gnostic, 75.
Valentinian, emperor, 115, 306.
Valerius Flaccus, 121.
Van Staveren, 257.
Vavassor, 100.
Venetian decree against theatricals, 126.
Venus, 249.
Vergil, 121, 166, 204, 205, 248, 277.
Versus de Afra et Flavio, 236.
Victor le Clerc, 124.
Victor, martyr, 204.
Viola, character in comedy of *Babio*, 203.
Virgin, the, in early Christian drama, 69.
Visitatio sepulchri, 59.
Vitalis Blessensis, 191.
Vitruvius, 167.
Voltaire, 61.
Vossius, 102, 187.
Vota, 47.

Wade, romance of, 237.
Warton, 60, 84, 121, 186, 247, 252, 260, 289.
Wedding, Byzantine, a scenic performance, 17.
Whitsun pastorals, 283.
Wiclyffe, 327.
William of Blois, 295, 301, 305.
William of Brittany, 207.
Winterfeld, Paulus de, 142, 162, 167.
Women choirs, 37.
Wright, Thomas, 153, 196, 202, 217, 219, 241, 242, 254.

Xanthopulus, 36.

Yson, 179, 180.

Zachary, pope, 19.
Zeno, emperor, 42, 43, 85, 86, 144, 145.
Zeno, Cretan tragedy, 202.
Zeus, 14, 86.
Zonaras, 105, 114.

LIBRARY



Digitized with financial assistance from



H T Parekh
FOUNDATION

An Initiative by
HDFC
WITH YOU, RIGHT THROUGH

on 28 December, 2018